# National Anti-Slavery Standard.

SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, EDITOR. WITHOUT CONCEALMENT...WITHOUT COMPROMISE. EDMUND QUINCY, CORRESPONDING EDITOR.

VOL. XIII. NO. 3. NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JUNE 10, 1852. WHOLE NO. 627.

Published weekly, on Thursday, by the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, at their office, No. 142 NASSAU STREET, NEW-YORK. Terms, Two DOLLARS per annum. Printed for the American Anti-Slavery Society, by NORRIS & JOHNSTON, printers, No. 21 Spruce street.


## Selections.

### COLOURED SEAMEN AND STATE RIGHTS.

OUR readers have not forgotten the correspondence which some time since took place between His Excellency, Gov. Means, and Her British Majesty's Consul, Mr. Matthew. We published in the *Standard*, of the 5th December last, the very temperate, dignified, and well-argued Report of Mr. Mazyck, Chairman of the Special Committee of the Senate, to whom had been referred the Message of the Governor transmitting this correspondence. In our issue of the 16th December, we gave to our readers the able Report of Mr. McCready, on behalf of the Committee of the other House, on the same subject.

We have now to call the attention of the public to the fact, that the practical issue has been made, by which the validity of the laws in regard to coloured seamen arriving in our port, is to be submitted to the judicial tribunals of the country. For ourselves, we have no fears for the credit of the State in such a controversy. The right of the State to control by her own legislation, the whole subject-matter can, as we think, by a full discussion, be established upon a basis which, in the South at least, will never hereafter be questioned. If there be defects in the details of the regulations enacted, the consideration of them is now precluded, when the issue is presented, is the right of the State to act at all in the premises.

The writ of *habeas corpus* was applied for, before Judge Withers, during the term of the court which has just closed, by the British Consul, through his counsel, Mr. Petigru, in behalf of one Manuel Pereira, a coloured sailor, who claims to be a Portuguese subject, articled to service on board an English brig, driven into this port by stress of weather, the said Manuel Pereira being then in jail, under the provisions of the Act of the Legislature of this State, passed in 1835, amendatory of the previous Acts on this subject. Judge Withers, in compliance with the requirements of the Act of 1844, refused the writ of *habeas corpus*, and notice of appeal has been given. Thus, is the issue upon us.

We have but one regret in the matter, and that is, that the case made is one where the party asking his liberty has been driven into our harbour involuntarily. Great Britain, it is true, is the last power which should complain on this account, with her own example in the case of the *Enterprize* before her eyes; but we do not, we confess, like the feature of the law. We have no doubt, however, that this fact being brought to the notice of the Executive, he would interfere promptly to release the individual in the present case (or, indeed, any other similar case), provided the party petitions for the purpose, and engages at once to leave the State. But we shall see nothing of this. Mr. Manuel Pereira, like another John Wilkes, is to have settled, in his person, great questions of constitutional liberty. The posterity which, in after times, shall read of his voluntary martyrdom, and heroic self-sacrifice in the cause of suffering humanity, must be somewhat better informed than Mr. Pereira himself, for we observe that his clerkly skill did reach the point of enabling him to subscribe his name to the petition for *habeas corpus*, which is to figure so conspicuously in future history, it being more primitively witnessed by his "*mark*."
—*Charleston Standard.*

THE LAW REGARDING COLOURED SEAMEN.—The Legislature of Louisiana, after full consideration of the representations that have been addressed to them, have repealed those provisions of their law which provided for the imprisonment of coloured seamen from abroad, and have substituted for this a provision allowing such seamen to land for their necessary duties with a passport from the Mayor. We have not yet seen the statute, and cannot say whether it applies to coloured seamen from the North as from foreign countries. In regard to the former, we should be decidedly opposed to placing them on the same footing as the latter, except where they are driven into ports by stress of weather. But even in regard to them, it seems to us that our law ought to be changed on the principle of the Illinois and Indiana constitutions. Let coloured seamen from the North be *forbidden* to enter our ports, and let their introduction subject the vessel to a fine of a thousand dollars for every one, and we venture to say we should be no more troubled with the visits of those precious "citizens of Massachusetts." We shall publish the Louisiana statute as soon as we can get a copy.—*Charleston Mercury.*

### SUPREME COURT OF MISSOURI.

IRENE EMERSON, Administrator, vs. DREDD SCOTT..... Error to St. Louis Circuit Court.

THIS was an action instituted by Dredd Scott against Irene Emerson, the wife and administratrix of Dr. John Emerson, to try his right to freedom. His claim is based upon the fact that his late master held him in servitude in the State of Illinois, and also in that territory ceded by France to the United States, under the name of Louisiana, which lies north of 36 degrees 30 minutes, north latitude, not included within the limits of the State of Missouri.

It appears that his late master was a surgeon in the army of the United States; and during his continuance in the service, was stationed at Rock Island, a military post in the State of Illinois, and at Fort Snelling, also a military post in the Territory of the United States, above described, at both of which places Scott was detained in servitude—at one place from the year 1834 until April or May, 1836; at the other, from the period last mentioned until the year 1838. The jury was instructed, in effect, that if such were the facts, they would find for Scott. He, accordingly, obtained a verdict.

The defendant moved for a new trial on the ground of misdirection by the Court, which being denied to her, she sued out this Writ of Error.

Cases of this kind are not strangers in our Courts. Persons have been frequently adjudged to be entitled to their freedom, on the ground that their masters held them in Slavery in Territories or States in which that institution was prohibited. From the first case decided in our courts, it might be inferred that the result was brought by a presumed assent of the master from the fact of having voluntarily taken his slave to a place where the relation of master and slave did not exist. But subsequent cases base the right "*to exact the forfeiture of emancipation*," as they term it, on the ground, it would seem, that it is the duty of the courts of this State to carry into effect the constitution and laws of other States and Territories, regardless of the rights, the policy or the institutions of the people of this State.

The States of this Union, although associated for some purposes of government, yet, in relation to their municipal concerns, have always been regarded as foreign to each other. The law of descendants of one State is not regarded in another, in the distribution of the estates of deceased persons. So of the law of wills, administrations, judicial proceedings, and all other matters of mere internal policy. The courts of one State do not take judicial notice of the laws of other States. They, when it is necessary to be shown what they are, must be proved like other facts. So of the laws of the United States, enacted for the mere purpose of governing a Territory. Those laws have no force in the States of the Union: they are local, and relate to the municipal affairs of the Territory. Their effect is confined within its limits; and beyond those limits, they have no more effect, in any State, than the municipal laws of one State would have in any other State: State of Virginia ats. Cohens Wheat. This doctrine is declared and maintained, not only with respect to nations strictly foreign to each other, but also to the several States of this Union. Every State has the right of determining how far, in a spirit of comity, it will respect the laws of other States. Those laws have no intrinsic right to be enforced beyond the limits of the State for which they were enacted. The respect allowed them will depend altogether on their conformity to the policy of our institutions: No State is bound to carry into effect enactments conceived in a spirit hostile to that which pervades her own laws. In the Conflict of Laws, sec. 30, it is said: but of the nature, extent and utility of this recognition of foreign laws respecting the state and condition of persons, every nation must judge for itself, and certainly is not bound to recognise them when they would be prejudicial to their own interests. It is, in the strictest sense, a matter of the comity of nations, and not of any absolute paramount obligation, superseding all discretion on the subject. So, in sec. 32, it is said, "it is difficult to conceive upon what ground a claim can be vested, to give any municipal laws an extra territorial effect, when those laws are prejudicial to the rights of other nations or to those of their subjects; it would at once annihilate the sovereignty and equality of every nation, which should be called upon to recognise and enforce them; or compel it to desert its own proper interests and duty to its own subjects in favour of strangers, who were regardless of both. A claim so naked of any principle or just authority to suport it, is wholly inadmissible." Again, "the comity of nations is derived altogether from the voluntary consent of the State by which it is shown, and is admissible, when it is contrary to its known policy or prejudicial to its interests. In the silence of the positive rule, affirming or denying, or restraining the operation of foreign laws, courts of justice presume the tacit adoption of them by their own government, unless they are repugnant to its policy or prejudicial to its interests: Sec. 38. It is a humiliating spectacle to see the courts of a State confiscating the property of her own citizens by the command of a foreign law. If Scott is freed, by what means will it be effected but by the constitution of the State of Illinois, or the Territorial laws of the United States? Now, what principle requires the interference of this Court? Are not those governments capable of enforcing their own laws; and if they are not, are we concerned, that such laws should be enforced, and that too at the cost of our own citizens?—States, in which an absolute prohibition of Slavery prevails, that if a slave, with the consent of his master, touch their soil, he thereby becomes free. The prohibition in the act, commonly called the Missouri Compromise, is absolute. How is that to be interpreted? That act is in force along our entire western boundary: if our courts take upon themselves the task of enforcing the laws of other States, it is nothing but reasonable that they should take them as they are understood where they are promulgated. If a slave passes our western boundary, by the order of his master, and goes into the territory subject to the Missouri Compromise, does he thereby become free? Most of the courts of this Union would say that he does, if his freedom is sought to be recovered under the laws of that territory? If our courts undertake the task of enforcing that act, should they not take it as most of the other States would? Some of our old cases say, that a hiring for two days would be a violation of the constitution of Illinois, and entitle the slave to his freedom. If two days would do, why not one? Is there any difference in principle or morality between holding a slave in a free territory two days more than one day? Why not six hours? The old cases say, the intent is nothing, the act is the thing. Now, are we prepared to say that we shall suffer these laws to be enforced in our courts? On almost three sides the State of Missouri is surrounded with free soil. If one of our slaves touch that soil with his master's consent, he becomes entitled to his freedom. Considering the numberless instances in which those living along the extreme frontier would have occasion to occupy their slaves beyond our boundary, how hard would it be if our courts should liberate all the slaves who should thus be employed. How unreasonable to ask it. If a master sends his slave to hunt his horses or cattle beyond the boundary, shall he thereby be liberated? But our courts, it is said, will not go so far. If not go the entire length, why go at all? The obligation to enforce to the proper degree is as obligatory as to enforce to any degree. Slavery is introduced by a continuance in the territory for six hours as well as for twelve months, and so far as our laws are concerned, the offence is as great in the one case as in the other. Laws operate only within the territory of the State for which they are made, and by enforcing them here, we, contrary to all principle, give them an extra territorial effect. Chancellor Kent says: "A statute, though not in the nature of a judicial proceeding, is, however, a record of the highest nature. But if a statute, though a matter of record, was to have the same effect in one State as in another, then one State would be dictating laws for another, and a fearful collision of jurisdiction would instantly follow. That construction is utterly inadmissible, while it is conceded to be a principle of public law, requisite for the safe intercourse and commerce of mankind, that acts, valid by the law of the State where they arise are valid everywhere, it is, at the same time, to be understood that this principle relates only to civil acts founded on the volition of parties, and not to such as proceed from the sovereign power. The force of the latter cannot be permitted to operate beyond the limits of the territory, without affecting the necessary independence of nations." 2 Kent, 117, 8.

This language is used when speaking in reference to the legislation of other States of the Union. It is conceded that there is no ground to presume or to impute any violation to Dr. Emerson, that his slave should have his freedom. He was ordered by superior authority to the posts where his slave was detained in servitude, and, in obedience to that authority, he repaired to them with his servant, as he very naturally supposed he had a right to do. To construe this into an assent to his slave's freedom would be doing violence to his acts. Nothing but a persuasion that it is a duty to enforce the foreign law, as though it was one of our own, could ever induce a court to put such a construction on his conduct. The present attitude of the parties to this suit is conclusive as to an actual consent, and nothing but the foreign law or the aid derived from it can raise an implied one. If the State of Missouri had prohibited Slavery within her limits, and our courts were called upon to execute that law, some zeal might be tolerated in our efforts to execute it: but while Slavery obtains here, there is no consideration which would warrant us in going such lengths against our own citizens, for having permitted their slaves to remain in the territory of a State where Slavery is prohibited.

In States and Kingdoms in which Slavery is the least countenanced, and where there is a constant struggle against its existence, it is admitted law, that if a slave accompanies his master to a country in which Slavery is prohibited, and remains there a length of time, if, during his continuance in such country, there is no act of manumission decreed by its courts, and he afterwards returns to his master's domicil, where Slavery prevails, he has no right to maintain a suit founded upon a claim of permanent freedom. This is the law of England, where it is said that her air is too pure for a slave to breathe in, and that no sooner does he touch her soil than his shackles fall from him: The case of slave Grace, 2 Haggara Adm'rl'ty Rep. 94. Story, in his Conflict of Law, says it has been solemnly decided that the law of England abbors and will not endure the existence of Slavery within the nation, and consequently, so soon as a slave lands in England, he becomes, ipso facto, a free man, and discharged from the state of servitude; and there is no doubt that the same principle pervades the common law of the non-slaveholding States in America; that is to say, foreign slaves would no longer be deemed such after their removal thither. But, he continues, it is a very different question how far the original state of Slavery might re-attach upon the party if he should return to the country by whose laws he was declared to be and was held as a slave: Sec. 95, 6. In the case of the commonwealth of Massachusettes vs. Ames, 18 Peck, Judge Shaw, although declining to give an express opinion upon this question, intimates very clearly that if the slave returns to his former country where Slavery obtains, his condition would not be changed. In the case of Graham vs. Strader, 5 Mon. 183, the Court of Appeals in Kentucky held that the owner of a slave, who resides in Kentucky, who permits his slave to go to Ohio in charge of an agent for a temporary purpose, does not forfeit his right of property in such slave.

An attempt has been made to show that the comity extended to the laws of other States is a matter of discretion, to be determined by the courts of that State in which the laws are proposed to be enforced. If it is a matter of discretion, that discretion must be controlled by circumstances. Times now are not as they were when the former decisions on this subject were made. Since then, not only individuals but States have been possessed with a dark and fell spirit in relation to Slavery, whose gratification is sought, the pursuit of measures, whose inevitable consequence must be the overthrow and destruction of our government. Under such circumstances, it does not behoove the State of Missouri to show the least countenance to any measure which might gratify this spirit. She is willing to assume her full responsibility for the existence of Slavery within her limits, nor does she seek to share or divide it with others. Although we may, for our own sakes, regret that the avarice and hard-heartedness of the progenitors of those who were so sensitive on the subject, ever introduced the institution among us, yet we will not go to them to learn law, morality or religion on the subject.

As to the consequences of Slavery, they are much more hurtful to the master than the slave. There is no comparison between the slave in the United States and the cruel, uncivilised negro in Africa. When the condition of our slaves is contrasted with their miserable race in Africa; when their civilization, intelligence and instruction in religious truths are considered, and the means now employed to restore them to the country from which they have been torn, bearing with them the blessings of civilized life, we are almost persuaded that the introduction of Slavery amongst us was in the providence of God, who makes the evil passions of men subservient to His own glory; a means of placing that unhappy race within the pale of civilized nations.

Judge Ryland concurring, the judgment will be reversed, and the cause remanded. WM. SCOTT.

This case overrules the following cases previously decided by the Supreme Court:

Mary vs. Tiffin & Menard, 1 Mo., 521.
Milly vs. Smith, 2 Mo., 32.
Milly vs. Smith, 2 Mo., 139.
Vincent vs. Duncan, 2 Mo., 174.
Ralph vs. Duncan, 3 Mo., 138.
Julia vs. McKenny, 3 Mo., 193.
Nati vs. Ruddle, 3 Mo., 282.
Rachel vs. Walker, 4 Mo., 351.
Wilson vs. Melville, 4 Mo., 592.

### THE FUGITIVE SLAVE LAW.

SENATE....May 26th, 1852.

PETITION OF THE NEW ENGLAND YEARLY MEETING (OF FRIENDS) FOR THE REPEAL (F THE FUGITIVE SLAVE LAW.

Mr. SUMNER. Mr. President, I hold in my hand, and desire to present to the Senate, a memorial from the representatives of the religious Society of Friends in New England, formally adopted at a public meeting, and authenticated by their clerk, in which they ask the repeal of the Fugitive Slave Law. After setting forth their sentiments upon the general subject of Slavery, the memorial proceeds as follows:

"We therefore respectfully, but earnestly and sincerely, entreat you to repeal the law of the last Congress respecting fugitive slaves—first and principally because of its injustice towards a long sore oppressed and deeply injured people; and secondly, in order that we, together with other conscientious sufferers, may be exonerated from the penalties which it imposes on all who, in faithfulness to their Divine Master, and in the discharge of their obligations to their distressed fellow-men, feel bound to regulate their conduct, even under the heaviest penalties that man can inflict for so doing, by the Divine injunction, "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them;" and by the other commandment, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and thy neighbour as thyself."

Mr. President, the memorial is commended by the character of the religious association from which it proceeds—men who mingle rarely in public affairs, but with austere virtue seek to carry out the Christian rule into life.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair will have to interpose. The senator is not now at liberty to enter into any discussion. The contents of the memorial can only be stated, and then the question will be taken whether it shall be received. If there is no objection, leave is given to the senator to present it; and after it is received, he can then make a motion with regard to its reference, and submit his remarks upon it.

Mr. SUMNER. It was not my intention at this time to enter into any discussion upon the memorial; I had a very few words to add previous to moving a reference of the memorial to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDENT. The memorial must first be received before a motion of reference can be made. A senator, in presenting a memorial, can state the object or contents of the memorial. It is then sent to the Chair and read, if desired, and a reference of it made; but it is not in order to go into a discussion of the merits of the question until the memorial has been received.

Mr. SUMNER. I did not propose to enter into any such discussion. I have already read a part of the memorial; and it was my design merely to refer to the character of the memorialists, to state the course I should pursue, and then move the reference of the memorial to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair will allow the senator to proceed, if such be the pleasure of the Senate.

Mr. DAWSON. Let him be heard.

Several SENATORS. Certainly; go on!

Mr. SUMNER. Mr. President, I observed that this memorial was commended by the character of the religious association from which it proceeds. It is commended also by its earnest and persuasive tone, and by the prayer which it presents. In offering it now, sir, I desire simply to say that I shall deem it my duty, on some proper occasion hereafter, to express myself at length on the matter to which it relates. Thus far during the session I have forborne. With the exception of an able speech from my colleague [Mr. Davis], the discussion of this all-absorbing question has been mainly left with senators from another quarter of the country, by whose mutual differences the question has been complicated, and between whom I have not cared to interfere. But there is a time for all things. Justice also requires that both sides should be heard; and I trust not to expect too much when, on some other occasion, I bespeak the clear and candid attention of the Senate while I undertake to set forth fully and frankly, and with entire respect for this body, convictions deeply cherished in my own State, though disregarded here, to which I am bound by every sentiment of the heart, by every fibre of my being, by all my devotion to country, and by all my love to God and man. But upon these I do not now enter. Suffice it for the present to say, that when I shall undertake that service, I believe that I shall utter nothing which in any just sense can be called *sectional*, unless the Constitution is *sectional*, and unless the sentiments of the fathers were *sectional*. It is my happiness to believe, and my hope to be able to show, that according to the true spirit of the Constitution, and according to the sentiments of the fathers, FREEDOM, and not Slavery, is NATIONAL; while SLAVERY, and not freedom, is SECTIONAL. In duty to the petitioners, and with the hope of promoting their prayer, I move the reference of this petition to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MANGUM. I do not rise, Mr. President, with the view of entering into a discussion of this subject, but to state that I believe it has been a settled practice in this body, on the occasion of a petition of that character being presented, to make a motion to lay it upon the table. I think that has been adopted as the rule in nearly all instances; but so far as regards this very Christian society of people usually called Quakers, I believe they are a most excellent people, and I am willing that their petition should be received. I am under the impression that they have been made an exception to this rule; they are a law-abiding people, and conscientious in their views upon this question, and we ought to treat them with a corresponding degree of respect. I hope there will be no objection to its reception.

The PRESIDENT. It has already been received.

Mr. MANGUM. Then I move that it be laid upon the table.

Mr. HALE. Will the honourable senator withdraw that motion for one moment?

Mr. MANGUM withdrew.

Mr. HALE. I merely wished to say that I am sorry I cannot agree with the honourable senator in his statement of the fact that no exception has been taken to the reception of petitions upon this subject.

Mr. MANGUM. If the senator will permit me, I said, when they come from honest Friends.

Mr. HALE. I did not understand it, then; and the rule is, that Friends are entitled to petition, and nobody else?

Mr. CLEMENS (in his seat). That's it.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. President, as the motion to lay the memorial on the table has been withdrawn, I wish to say a few words. If it be the desire of gentlemen to re-open this discussion—especially in the solemn manner and with the heartfelt conviction and Christian feeling which seemed to be overflowing from the senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Sumner]—if he desires an investigation and discussion of this question—now is the time. Let there be no evasion—no escape from the present crisis—no putting off what you intend to do until after the nomination takes place; but come out manly—come out boldly and meet the question. I dislike this manner of concealing things—this throwing dust and a cloud over what you intend to do. None of this deception, sir, whether religious or political; but let there be manliness—let there be firmness and frankness. I, for one, am prepared to meet this question; and I am one of those who never will seek any mode by which it shall be evaded. If gentlemen desire to throw firebrands into this country, let them do it! If they are more Christian in their feelings, and their hearts are more pure than mine, I want those feelings to be poured out. I trust, therefore, that if it be the desire of the senator from Massachusetts to enter into a discussion of this question, we will give him some opportunity; let the petition be referred, and let him fix upon some day for the discussion, and not seek to avoid it by saying "now I do not desire it." Now is the accepted time, sir. Let the question be met; let it be made a test question here, and we will see how the different sections of this country stand upon the question. Let there be no double dealing in politics or in religion; for hypocrisy is above all things to be detested.

I trust, Mr. President, that my friend, the honourable senator from North Carolina [Mr. Mangum], will let the friends of a repeal of this Fugitive Slave Law give this petition their own direction. I am one of those who desire that the North should have the exclusive right of declaring their sentiments upon this question. Let those who wish to rule the majority of the Southern portion of this country, almost the entire South, and give public opinion a political direction upon this question—let those who intend to take the responsibility in what are called the non-slaveholding States, declare the position upon which they intend to stand; and if they intend to rock this country to its foundations, if they intend to agitate, let it be done now. I repeat, *let it be done now*: and let not the four years which are to come under any administration tempt them to keep their views concealed for a time. If they are to persist in this course of agitation, let the country know the measures, and the man who is to represent this influence whom they intend to elevate to the presidential chair. I repeat, sir, that this indirect mode of dealing, on the eve of a presidential election, shows that there are things which are not to be thrown before the country. These sanctimonious gentlemen seem to say to the whole world, "We are so pure, so generous in our feelings, that we do not want to violate the Constitution; and yet you are going contrary to the Constitution." I want to have the question settled. I want to know whether we are or not. For one, I mean, if I can, to pursue that course which shall bring gentlemen up to a test of the question. I will do it if any motion which I can submit will have the tendency to enable the question to be met. I say now is the accepted time—now is the day and now is the hour.

Mr. ADAMS. If my friend from Georgia will allow me to make a suggestion to him, I think the better way to test this would be to move to lay it upon the table, and make that the test vote.

Mr. DAWSON. I do not desire that any gentleman upon this floor shall be precluded from expressing his opinion upon this subject. On the contrary, I want them to come up boldly and manly. I want this question handled no more with soft political gloves for party purposes. I want manliness—I want firmness. If gentlemen desire sectional agitation, I, sir, am now prepared for it. After doing all that man can do to harmonize these turbulent elements, it seems there is a determination in certain quarters still to agitate this question; but they want to pass over the present hour and not touch it now, with a view to raise these issues hereafter for party purposes. I am against that policy.

Mr. BADGER. Mr. President, I am not exactly in the same bellicose humour with my honourable friend from Georgia this morning; but, sir, believing that we have some matters of dollars and cents to attend to upon this deficiency bill, and that after this furious onslaught upon the subject of the repeal of the Fugitive Slave Law, the Senate can be more profitably engaged in the discharge of their practical business, I propose that we shall do ourselves that credit, and therefore renew the motion to lay this memorial upon the table.

Mr. BUTLER. I will only say that upon the question of laying the memorial upon the table I agree with the views of the honourable senator from Georgia.

Mr. WELLER demanded the yeas and nays; which were ordered.

Mr. DAWSON. If this is considered a test question, my vote will be one way. If the Senate desire that it shall be laid aside merely for the present, I may vote the other way.

Mr. CHASE, (interposing). I call the senator to order.

The PRESIDENT. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. BADGER. If laid upon the table it can be taken up at any time.

The PRESIDENT. It can be taken up whenever the Senate think proper.

The question being then taken, resulted—yeas 40, nays 10—as follow:

YEAS—Messrs. Adams, Atchison, Badger, Bell, Bradbury, Bright, Brodhead, Brooke, Cass, Clemens, Cooper, Dawson, Desaussure, Dodge of Iowa, Douglas, Downs, Felch, Fish, Foote, Geyer, Hunter, James, Jones of Iowa, Jones of Tennessee, King, Mallory, Mangum, Miller, Norris, Pearce, Pratt, Rusk, Sebastian, Smith, Soule, Spruance, Toucey, Underwood, Upham and Weller—40.

NAYS—Messrs. Borland, Chase, Davis, Dodge of Wisconsin, Hale, Hamlin, Seward, Sumner, Wade and Walker—10.

Before the decision of the question,

Mr. ATCHISON said: Mr. President, I am caught in such bad company that I ask leave to change my vote. I vote aye [laughter].

The result was then announced and the petition was laid upon the table.

### AMERICAN SLAVERY.—IS DR. DYER AN ADVOCATE OF SLAVERY?

I.

*To the Editor of the British Banner:*

SIR—Being a constant reader of the *Banner*, and admiring what you said on the subject of Slavery, I take the liberty of asking you a question—viz: Is the gentleman who spoke last evening on the platform at Exeter Hall, named Dr. Dyer, from Philadelphia, a slave-owner, or an advocate of Slavery? As a lover of truth, I am desirous of learning if the rumour of last evening is correct, before I say anything to the Committee of the Sunday School Union on the subject.

Your obedient servant,
JAMES S. HEATHER.

102 Wood Street, May 7, 1852.

II.

*To the Editor of the British Banner:*

SIR—At the Anniversary of the Sunday School Union last evening, the Rev. Dr. Dyer, from America, was introduced, and addressed the meeting.

Many persons were anxious to know the Rev. gentleman's sentiments respecting Slavery, but, from the very cautious manner in which he avoided all allusion to that subject, we were left in doubt, and even in fear.

If his hands are clean in this matter, he is welcome to our Christian assemblies; but, if not, the sooner he knows the feelings of the British Churches the better.

Can you inform your readers?

Yours truly?
ROBERT GAMMAN.

III.

*To the Editor of the British Banner:*

SIR—Facts are stubborn things, and truth is oftentimes stranger than fiction. Will it be credited? will it be believed, that the Sunday School Union, which, at its annual meeting in 1851, trumpeted forth to the world its deep abhorrence of that anti-Christian system of bondage which is the curse, as it is the disgrace, of America—that this same Union, on Thursday evening last, virtually annulled its opinion of last year, by permitting Dr. Dyer, of America—a staunch apologist for Slavery—to address the meetings, and yet such was the case. Why, sir, had the Committee been devising the best means of casting an insult upon the Sabbath School teachers of Great Britain, they could not have hit upon anything more calculated to arouse their indignation, than that of allowing a man, the professed upholder of the blackest system that has ever disgraced fallen humanity, to hold forth at its annual meeting.

With the most perfect nonchalance, Dr. Dyer stood before a British audience, whom he must know to be the enemies of Slavery wherever it exists, and unblushingly disclosed to them the glorious doings of the American Sunday School Union; their success in raising funds, establishing schools, and planting the standard of the Cross wherever a white man was to be found. He spoke, too, of the flood of immigration that was continually pouring into the shores of America from our sister isle, of the destitution that existed, and of the vast settlements that were being made in the valley of the Mississippi, and expressed a hope, that at some future time, not very far distant, that great country would be thoroughly evangelized; but not a word did he say of that system which tears husbands from wives, brothers from sisters, and parents from their children; which outvies all other systems in its refinement of cruelty, its worse than barbarous atrocities, and its wholesale murders. No! this was cautiously left out of the catalogue, and the meeting left in a state of bliss (if ignorance is bliss!) as to the opinions of the man who was thus obtruding himself upon their time. And shall this be suffered to pass unnoticed? What! British Sabbath School teachers allow themselves to be taught how to prosecute their work, by one who is an apologist for the retention of upwards of three millions and a half of his fellow creatures in a state of the most complete mental and bodily degradation. I cannot believe it; but who is to blame? Either there must have been the most wilful and culpable neglect or the most gross carelessness on the part of those who had the management of the meeting. Let it not be supposed that the Sabbath School teachers of England have any sympathy with the principles which Dr. Dyer upholds and enunciates, or that they have made any compromise of principles which were so openly avowed at their previous meeting; but, let it be known that they have the deepest abhorrence of that infernal system which robs so many of their sacred liberties, and which is even practised and supported principally by those who profess and call themselves Christians! Do, sir, use your influence to screen Sunday School teachers from any imputation of inconsistency that may be cast upon them by this event, which, if passed over in silence, will, most assuredly, be construed into a tacit recognition of the justice of Slavery! Dr. Dyer and Dr. Baird would do well to go hand in hand (*par nobile fratrum!*), but let us at least cleanse British platforms from anomalies similar to the one witnessed on Thursday last.

I am, sir, yours faithfully,
May 7, 1852. T. S. MARKS.

[Since all danger lies on the side of abstinence, not on that of excess, in public protests on the subject of Slavery, we have inserted the foregoing letters. Let it not for a moment, however, be supposed, that the Committee of the Sunday School Union are compromised by the employment of Dr. Dyer; for we have it, under the hand of the Honorary Corresponding Secretary, Mr. W. Groser, that there is no evidence that Dr. Dyer is the apologist, much less the advocate, of that hideous crime, American Slavery, nor that any blame is fairly chargeable on the Committee of the Sunday School Union.—ED. *B. B.*]

Since the above was written, we have received the following letter:

*To the Editor of the British Banner:*

SIR—I have just ascertained from authority, upon which I can rely, that

1. Dr. Dyer has no Church or pastoral charge, therefore cannot have, as is stated, "slaveholding members."

2. That he is the Episcopal agent of the American Sunday-School Union, and that his whole time is devoted to the objects of that extensive and useful Institution.

3. That when Dr. Dyer replied, as stated by a correspondent of the *Morning Advertiser*, in answer to the question. Does your Church contain slaveholders? "I presume so," he meant the Episcopal denomination—a fact patent to all England; indeed, I fear every religious denomination in the Southern States of America is tainted with this moral leprosy.

I am, sir, yours obliged,
WM. GROSER,
Cor. Sec'y Sunday-School Union, May 11, 1852.

### SUNDAY-SCHOOL UNION.—THE REV. DR. DYER.—AMERICAN SLAVERY.

SIR,—As a fugitive from American Slavery, I have watched with no little degree of interest the discussion carried on for some days past in your paper, relative to the appearance of the Rev. Dr. Dyer on the platform of Exeter Hall, at the anniversary of the Sunday-school Union. The letters have nearly all been good, your own strictures admirable, and I, for one, feel thankful that you have brought the subject before the public. If American pro-slavery divines and others are allowed to come with impunity before a British assembly and speak with approbation, it enables them to spread with much greater facility their opinions in favour of Slavery when they are in private circles. Although Dr. Dyer and myself come from the same country, I am not acquainted with either him or his views on the subject of Slavery.

But I do know something of the institution which he represents. In the year 1832, the American Sunday School Union published a series of small books, containing an account of some of the most interesting persons and principle events mentioned in the Old Testament. These books were written in a style adapted to the comprehension of children, and well calculated to impress the young mind with a knowledge of the history of the Israelites, from Abraham to the birth of the Saviour. One of these volumes was entitled, "The Story of Isaac, or the First Part of a Conversation between Mary and her Mother."

Commencing with the call of Abraham, it contained a sketch of his life and that of Isaac, until the marriage of the latter with Rebekah. "Jacob and his Sons, or the second part of a conversation between Mary and her Mother," began with the birth of Esau and Jacob, and contained a narrative of Esau's sale of his birthright to Jacob: of the manner in which Rebekah obtained Isaac's blessing for Jacob; of the hatred with which Jacob's sons regarded their brother Joseph; of their selling Joseph into Slavery; of his imprisonment, and subsequent elevation to great power; and of the removal of Jacob and his family to Egypt. You will see, Sir, that the design of the book was excellent, and intended to do good. This book was stereotyped, and for more than seventeen years was one of the most popular of the series. But, during 1848, a slaveholding Vice-President of the American Sunday School Union, residing in South Carolina, discovered that a certain passage in "Jacob and his Sons" was discourteous towards the "Peculiar Institution," and immediately wrote to headquarters, and demanded that the circulation of the offensive book he instantly stopped; and, strange to say, the executive committee of the American Sunday School Union, at the demand of the slave power, dropped from its catalogue a book which had run through many editions, and was a great favourite with the people.

The following, which I quote from the book that lies before me, is the offensive sentence, and is the only part of the work in which Slavery is mentioned:

"'What is a slave, mother?' asked Mary; 'is it a servant?'

"'Yes,' replied her mother, "slaves are servants, for they work for their masters, and wait on them; but they are not hired servants, but are bought and sold like beasts, and have nothing but what their master chooses to give them. They are obliged to work very hard, and sometimes their masters use them cruelly, beat them, and starve them, and kill them, for they have nobody to help them. Sometimes they are chained together, and driven about like beasts.'

"'Poor things!' said Mary; 'but why do they not leave their masters when they use them ill? The other day Margaret left you, mother, because she was tired of living here, though you never treated her unkindly; I wonder that the slaves stay with their masters, who are not kind to them.'

"'They do not like to be slaves,' answered her mother; 'but they are not permitted to leave their masters whenever they wish. Servants are paid for working for their masters and mistresses, and, if they do not like to stay, they may go and live somewhere else. But the poor unhappy slaves are obliged to stay with their master as long as he chooses to keep them. And if the master is tired of his slaves, then he may sell them to another if he wishes to.'"

After it became known that the book in question had been discontinued, several of the churches in the Free States, and auxiliary societies, became dissatisfied, and the officers of the parent society written to. Mr. Frederick A. Packard, one of the secretaries of the American Sunday School Union, by the order of the executive committee, in a letter under date of 3d of February, 1848 (and I quote from the letter which lies before me), says, "We dropped *Jacob and his Sons* from our catalogue because it contained a statement which our committee considered liable to serious misconstruction." The serious "misconstruction" here referred to was that it might be thought to mean American Slavery instead of the bondage referred to in the Scriptures. And here be it remembered, that the book had been in circulation seventeen years, and not until the spirit of Slavery demanded its expulsion, did the committee find that it "contained a statement which was liable to a serious misconstruction."

Thus, Sir, the American Sunday-School Union is not only pro-slavery, but it becomes the apologist of Slavery, it bows down to the slave power, and acknowledges the right of the southern slaveholders to be the censors of the northern press. This truckling to southern arrogance is unworthy of a benevolent and religious society, dangerous to the morals of the rising generation, and disgraceful to the nation and Christianity. The whole affair is nothing less than a demand of the slaveowner and an acquiescence on the part of the Committee to suppress a valuable book, because it defined American Slavery according to the slave code and general practice of slaveholders. This society is considered so pro-slavery, that many of the Northern churches have withheld from it their contributions. The following vote of the church at Farmington, Connecticut, which I quote from its own proceedings, which are before me, will, I think, satisfy your readers that the society which Dr. Dyer represents is pro-slavery, and unworthy of confidence, if, indeed, Dr. Dyer is not himself a slaveholder:

VOTE OF THE CHURCH.

"Whereas, the American Sunday School Union, in their recent proceedings, in suppressing one of their books, called *Jacob and his Sons*, on account of an expression in said book on the subject of Slavery, which was regarded by their Southern friends as offensive, have done what we cannnot but regard as an act of subserviency to the slave power; and whereas, upon our corresponding with them on the subject, they have failed to give us any satisfactory explanation of their course, and having refused to restore the book, upon our request, to their catalogue of publications; therefore,

"Resolved, That the American Sunday School Union be stricken from the list of the beneficiaries of this Church, and that we will seek some other channel for our beneficence to this cause."

I am, Sir, your obedient Servant,
WM. WELLS BROWN.
22, Cecil-street, Strand, May 15.
—*From the London Morning Advertiser.*

WE copy from the *Christian* [so called] *Advocate and Journal* the following report of a curious debate in the Methodist Convention, last week, in Boston, on the subject of sending a Bishop to Africa. A Church without a Bishop is evidently not half so much dreaded by those wily parsons as a General Conference with a black Bishop on the Platform. They would rather the African Methodists should go to hell, as, of course, they believe they must without a temporal head to the Church, than that a black head should show itself on the Bench at home:

"1. Resolved, That measures be taken to insure the due exercise of Episcopal functions in the Liberia Mission Conference."

C. Elliott said there were two ways in which that resolution could be carried out. The first way was, by appointing a missionary bishop, for that temporary purpose, to go to that part of the world. What was to hinder one of the bishops that they were about to elect, from going, at least twice to Africa in the next four years. He would not be for sending our venerable bishops, though perhaps Bishop Janes would go very readily. Where was the difficulty of sending one or two of the bishops they were to elect—middle-aged men they would be, no doubt, men capable of doing work—what was to hinder their sailing to Africa? If they were very much afraid of dying or getting seriously hurt, they might stay on board ship at nights, and then let them hold their conference, and carry out the purposes of their mission. If they had not the men willing to go, he would say, "Let us begin to calculate upon giving up our mission, and ask our good Congregational and Presbyterian brethren to go to work and occupy the place which we have abandoned, because we had not the martyr spirit among us.

Now, when we said these things he had no idea that there was a minister in the whole M. E. Church, who was not too far advanced in years and was in moderate health, who would shrink from this enterprise. He did not believe that they ever had, or had now, a bishop who would confer a moment with flesh and blood in regard to this matter.

He then proceeded to consider the prospects of Methodism in other parts of the world, saying that he loved to look ahead. He hoped the time would come when they would feel called upon to send a missionary bishop to Germany, to Italy, and other lands, and he should rejoice to do so, and gather them all into the fold of Christ. In conclusion, he said that he did not think that the Liberia Mission was yet pr

There was another example—that of Canada. When the General Conference authorized the Canada brethren to declare themselves an independent organization, they authorized our bishops, to ordain them a bishop, if they should see fit to select one. They did select one, but he refused to go. With all these examples before them, and with the necessity of the case, it did appear to him that the course proposed by the committee was the most wise and prudent one.

G. Peck did not entirely agree with the report; while, at the same time, he perfectly harmonized with all that had been said by his worthy friend Dr. Durbin, in relation to the great importance of a full organization of the Church in Africa—an organization which will provide for ordination, and constitute the ministers there so far independent as to enable them to provide for their own perpetuity, and to administer the ordinances.

He, however, was not able to see that the plan proposed in that report would prove the most expedient. In the first place, he did not believe that the ministers in that mission had reached a position which would warrant an independent jurisdiction.

Now, he had been chairman of the standing committee of the Missionary Board upon the African Mission for some ten years, and had conversed with every missionary who had returned from that field, upon the subject of the superintendency, and, up to the last moment, heard nothing of this plan of an independent Episcopal Church; and he doubted if such an episcopacy as is proposed in the report would well affect either the bishop or the Conference.

My principal objection to the report would rest upon this point—that it allows them to become as entirely independent of us as the Church in Canada or the Church South. We consequently should have no legitimate jurisdiction over them. We should have no other hold upon them than that which arises from their dependance on us for an appropriation of $20,000 a year. The report, indeed, requires that they shall adopt the Methodist Discipline, and continue to keep it. How are we to determine whether they preserve Methodism in its purity? How shall we be able to exercise any influence over them, as all their dependance on us is merely for an annual appropiation? Then we are in the anomalous position of appropriating money to an independent Church.

I have thought of two plans, either of which would meet the case. Let one of our bishops visit Africa at suitable intervals, preside in the Conference, ordain men elected to deacon's orders, and provide a superintendency during his absence. Or, he would provide for ordination by the President of the Conference. Either of these plans would meet the necessity of the case. Our Episcopacy was constituted by Presbyters: we professed to believe that this was the apostolic ground of Episcopal authority. The doctrine in 1828, in connexion with the petition from Canada for an independent organization, was, that we had no jurisdiction over the societies under a foreign government, any further than they saw proper to consent to that jurisdiction. Consequently, we did not establish an independent Church in Canada, but simply provided that, when they should organize themselves into an independent Church, and should elect a bishop, if they desired it, our Bishops might ordain him.

Now, we have reached a period in the history of our missions, when it seems necessary to provide some plan for ordination on the ground. When our missions begin to furnish their own labourers, there should be an organization to confer upon them the full functions of the ministry. We must provide for this in some way, or our ministry there will be crippled. A missionary bishop would be confined to foreign territory, and would not be identified with our general superintendency. It would be the same as stationing our bishops in different sections of this country, and not requiring them to travel throughout the connexion. He believed in the unity of our Episcopacy; it was no mere fancy. A bishop has as much power in one place as he has in another, and so long as this is the case, and the bishops are left to divide the work among themselves, our Episcopacy is a complete unity. It will not answer to make a bishop, and send him to Africa, to Italy, to Germany, or China, and tell him that he is bishop there and nowhere else. This would he diocesan Episcopacy.

If neither of our bishops can visit Africa, he would be willing to adopt something like the following arrangement: The bishop having charge of the missions shall annually appoint a Superintendent of the African mission and it shall be his duty,

1. To superintend the spiritual and temporal interests of the mission in Western Africa.
2. To preside in the Annual Conference.
3. To ordain, by the assistance of the elders, such elders and deacons as may be elected by the Conference.

This plan might be ultimately carried out in all our missions, when the proper period should arrive. By this means, we might elevate to the functions of the ministry native preachers, without exposing a bishop to the hazard of visiting unhealthy climes or requiring them to come to this country to have Episcopal hands laid on them.

E. R. Ames thought the Conference were agreed on the principle of the first resolution, and if that were adopted they could then discuss the details of the plan; when they had recognised the principle, then they could consider the measures for carrying it into effect.

J. A. Collins said our episcopacy was peculiar in its character, and intended to be so. It was not like the episcopacy in the Episcopal Church, which was diocesan; but it was an itinerant general superintendency—a bishop in one part was a bishop in any part, with full power and authority. It was pleaded in 1844 that the episcopacy was a unit, and because it was to pervade the whole length and breadth of the M. E. Church, therefore, the General Conference was not competent to station the bishops in distinct sections of the country.

He did not believe the bishops before him, or any bishops the M. E. Church had ever had, got their authority from their predecessors. Their authority came from the eldership; and he confessed that the idea of the efficacy of the mere imposition of hands conveyed to his mind something much more fanciful than the idea that the episcopacy was a unit, because the Discipline was their authority for that. But he was no High Church Episcopalian: he repudiated it. He believed their authority was in the Discipline, the whole of it; and if it was to be that the Church in Africa was to become independent, let them appoint their bishop. When they could take care of themselves, let them appoint their own bishops, and then, if they wished us to ordain them, as an act of courtesy, let us do it; but nothing further.

N. Bangs agreed with his good Brother Collins that the superintendency was a general itinerant one, and must remain so; but it did not follow that it was a unit, and that it must extend all over the world. Suppose they should want a bishop in Persia; must that bishop be so trammelled that he could do nothing but come here and sit as a delegate? He was opposed to any such idea. He was surprised at the doctrine advanced there; it tended to annihilate our episcopacy all together. Brother Collins said the authority was with us. But who put it there? John Wesley, as an instrument of God, put it there. We derived our existence from him, and not from the Conference; we had it now, because it was deposited with us. We could elect a bishop, but we could not ordain him. If we had no bishop, he admitted that we could do so; but that was an extreme case. If an annual conference were to rise up and say "we possess the power of ordaining men, and reject the episcopacy," they would be treated as heritics, and very justly so. He was an Episcopalian, from head to foot. He loved the episcopacy, because he believed it was ordained of God, and because God had blessed it.

H. Slicer said it was difficult for plain people to know what to do, when doctors were so far apart. He thought the whole question was settled, after free and full debates in 1840. At that time, Dr. Bangs urged the Conference to make Brother Seys a bishop. He recollected that the same arguments were adduced then, that had been adduced in this debate; and the Conference, by a very heavy vote, refused to adopt the report, and sent it back to the committee three several times, and it went to the tomb of the Capulets at last—fortunately for the Church.

The analogy that Dr. Bangs claimed did not exist. They had been told that Mr. Wesley sent over Dr. Coke. Very good; but Mr. Wesley acted without any such restriction as that which they had placed in the Discipline. Again, it was urged that the Episcopal Church ordained missionary bishops. That argument failed, because the Episcopal Church was diocesan in its character; he had an Itinerant General Superintendency, with equal powers everywhere that its functions are discharged. They could not make a bishop for Africa, or for China, or for the Pacific, that would not be part and parcel of the episcopacy in the M. E. Church in the United States. Just as soon as that bishop touched our shores, whether he were black or white, he claimed equality with those venerable men upon the bench.

He did not like the report of the committee. He did not like its phraseolgy, he did not like it, because it was not true. He did not like it because it contradicted St. Paul. It averred that the people at Liberia were an "entirely different race" from ourselves. That they were a different race, he admitted; but the language was too strong. Had not God pronounced by the voice of St. Paul, in his memorable sermon on Mars Hill, that "he hath made of one blood all nations of men;" yet they were told in that report, that they were a race entirely by themselves. That their hair and skin were different, he admitted, but they were not by any means an entirely different race.

Again, he objected to the report, because of the manner in which it was sought to do this thing. What right had they to elect a bishop for Liberia? He admitted that they had a right, as a delegated General Conference, to instruct the bishops when a man shall be proposed for ordination that they shall ordain him; but he did not believe they had any right to create a bishop for Liberia, unless he be one who shall be detailed by the action of this body, to look after that particular work. He rather inclined to the opinion, on the whole, that the subject had better be left in the hands of the episcopacy.

J. P. Durbin said the expression in the report "an entirely different race of men," was misunderstood. He was suprised that his brother should think the committee used the language in any objectionable sense.

H. Mattison proposed simply to state a few facts in regard to the origin of the pending report. Six members of the committee dissented from the majority, and opposed the report by argument and by their votes. Most of the objections stated by Dr. Peck were named in the committee; but the minority were gloriously voted down, and the Conference must now decide between them. The Liberia Conference is a part of the M. E Church, having all the rights of any other Conference, with the exception of sending delegates to this body, and drawing funds from the Book Concern. Now, this report provides that the Liberia Conference withdraw or separate from the Church, the language employed being almost the precise language of the "Plan of Separation" of 1844. The principal difference he could discover was, that in one case the Atlantic lay between us and those who were to separate and set up for themselves; and in the other it was Mason and Dixon's line. He would not argue the question, but was opposed to the report, and hoped the Conference was ready to vote it down.

A M. Osborn said if he supposed it was the intention of the committee to moot the disputed question of the Episcopacy, he might hesitate to vote for the report; but he did not so understand it. He had not heard anything read from the report that looked in the slightest degree toward this mooted question, on which it is evident they were not agreed. The first resolution, as he understood it, only expressed in behalf of the General Conference our preferences for an Episcopal Church in Africa, if it should be separated from us. Could any brother hesitate between the forms of government for Africa? It was not, in his view, a question of ministerial grade, but a question of church order. If we could not continue our connexion with them advantageously to them and to ourselves, let us then provide them such functions of ministerial power as will secure the perpetuity of our form of government in Africa.

The remark of Bro. Mattison in relation to the Church South, seemed to him not parallel to this case at all, because that portion of the M. E. Church was in the same country and in the same Conference. It was not so with our societies in Africa. They are separated from us just as we were separated from Mr. Wesley. The change of government in this country made it necessary for him to change the order of things here in relation to ecclesiastical government. They had an independent government in Liberia, as perfect in its functions and principles and powers of action, as we had in this country, and why should they not have a separate Church? It seemed to him, that while they had the power, they should provide for them a form of Church government, and he thought that in doing so, and in passing that resolution, they would only exercise their preference. Whether it was a high Church or a low Church government, he did not care. It was the practical form of the thing, and not the doctrinal element that they regarded, and that was all they held to be essential in this matter. He hoped they would adopt the resolution; and then, if it was decided that it was not best to make them into an independent government, he hoped they would decide, when they do become independent, to send a bishop there.

L. Hitchcock offered the following as a substitute for the original resolution:

"Resolved, That measures be taken to insure the due exercise of the powers of ordination in the Liberia Annual Conference."

J. P. Durbin thought this did not meet the wants of the Liberia Conference; they needed government as well as ordination. On motion, the substitute was laid on the table.

G. Peck opposed that feature in the report which contemplated the independence of the Church in Africa at the present time. He had said that they might meet the emergency by the periodical visitation of one of the bishops; or they might meet it in another way, as he proposed, and which he thought would be legitimate. Several conclusions had been drawn from his plan which he did not acknowledge. He did not believe that this General Conference could institute a plan for ordination by elders anywhere on this continent, under our present constitution; but our Foreign Missions are clearly exceptions to the general rule, as much so as the case of ordination by elders, if all our bishops were dead. That emergency was provided for by law, and why might not this be?

It might not be expedient to institute a plan for ordination by presbyters, but it would be in perfect harmony with our system—with the doctrine of ordination adopted by Mr. Wesley, and carried out in the organization of the M. E. Church in the United States. Whether the exigency was one of real necessity certainly deserved well to be considered, and he did not doubt that the General Conference would come to a wise determination in relation to the matter.

The discussion closed by the passage of a motion to recommit the report.


## National Anti-Slavery Standard.

*** *All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns should be addressed,* to SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, *New-York.*

†‡† *Donations to the Treasury of the* AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY *may be forwarded to* FRANCIS JACKSON, *Treasurer, at Boston; or to* SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, *New-York.*

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JUNE 10, 1852.


### THE DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION.

MANY Conventions have done virtuously, but the Democratic Convention which has just adjourned at Baltimore has excelled them all. It did its work beautifully and to our entire satisfaction. It illustrated to perfection the way in which Presidents are made and the influences which must ever govern that branch of our domestic manufactures. It showed how our affairs are managed so as to give the minority the control of them. This is as it should be. The Constitution of the country is arranged for this very end, and all the subordinate operations under it should be consonant with it. We live under a form of government which makes it a necessity that a minority of less than a two hundredth part of the inhabitants should rule the whole, and all the minor parts of the machinery should work accordingly. The object of the two-thirds rule is to give the slaveholding minority the control of the Nomination. It is a perfectly rational and proper one. It is merely putting into a visible shape the acknowledgement of the supremacy which everybody feels. To be sure, it was used on this occasion for another purpose. For there was no controversy with the Slave Power. The whole Convention and all its candidates were at its feet. It had only to throw the handkerchief to its favourite. One would answer its purpose as well as another, and its choice was to be determined by the circumstances which rendered one man more easily eligible, or *electable*, than another. It having become advisable for our Lords Paramount to govern by a Northern Viceroy, it having been found that they are more manageable, even, than one of themselves might be, the choice was confined to Northern men, and the choice was an admirable one.

The whole game at Baltimore, last week, was very diverting. A tremendous amount of enthusiasm was got up for certain prominent men before the Convention, while all the time, the wire-pullers knew from the beginning as well as we do now that none of them could be chosen, and had probably fixed on the very man on whom the choice was finally to fall. Forty eight ballotings and four days were sacrifices offered on the altar of Rescombe. The friends of Cass, Buchanan, Douglas, and all the rest of them, were to be satisfied that everything was done for them that could be, so that they would submit patiently to the Compromise candidate. It was absolutely necessary that a new man should be brought forward. The animosities of the partizans of these competitors rendered it unsafe to nominate any of them. So this slaughter-house was erected and Cass and the others knocked on the head just where Martin Van Buren had been eight years before. It was a beautiful piece of poetical justice. The same two-thirds rule that slew Van Buren then, gave the *coup de grace* to Cass now. The engineer was hoist with his own petard. Cato's ghost will stalk no longer unavenged amongst the Democratic hosts. The Democratic party in New York will bury the hatchet and hold a fraternal pow-wow in the Hall of Saint Tammany. Cass is *squelched* forever (God be thanked for *that!*) and the torch of the burners of barns will hover no more about the premises of Democracy. They will dwell together in peace and possess themselves joyfully of the spoils of the Whig Philistines that now inhabit the Promised Land.

But this is not the only piece of poetical justice, nor the one that gives us the most unmitigated delectation. The Compromise, of course, is made a point of the Democratic Platform. That we expected. General Pierce will do as much to maintain it as Cass or Webster could do, or he could not have been nominated. But, then, none of the men who fastened it upon the country, and who built their hopes of the Presidency upon their services in that direction, have got the nomination. Nor even any of the men who made haste to identify themselves with it, or who have publicly touched it in any way. Our readers will remember that a certain Robert G. Scott, of Virginia, took it upon himself to write to all the persons ever mentioned as possible candidates at Baltimore, interrogating them as to their fidelity to Slavery. Every one of them, as soon as they received the *firman* of their master, fell upon his knees, put his mouth in the dust, without putting his hand over it, and ate dirt in a way that might astonish a Bushman. All except General Pierce, and *he* is the man that got the nomination! Now we do not think so ill of the gallant general as to doubt his entire readiness to eat any quantity of that necessary aliment of Northern ambition; but we think he had discretion enough to see that a masterly inactivity was his true policy. It was perfectly understood that the Compromise was to be endorsed and made part of the platform; but, then, by way of sop to the enemies of the Compromise, real and politic, no man was to be nominated who had ever touched it, even with the nib of his pen. It will be so in the Whig Convention, if they be not greater fools than even Whigs are apt to be. So we shall have the satisfaction of knowing that though Cass, Webster, Douglas, Fillmore & Company sold the country to the devil, and gave themselves as the earnest of the bargain, they have not got their pay, and never will.

We think the nomination of General Pierce a very strong one. So strong, indeed, that if the Whigs would only be obliging enough to set up Fillmore or Webster (which we do not think the Democrats can reasonably hope), we believe he would have the almost unanimous vote of the Electoral College. Should they nominate General Scott, as they will if they know enough to go in when it rains (and with a very hard shower coming up!), there will be a harder run; but the odds are that the New Hampshire nag will distance him. As against any other competitors, he will walk over the course. His strength lies in his insignificance. Nobody knows anything about him, and consequently nobody knows anything against him. We suppose, should the inhabitants of the United States be polled and asked the question, three quarters of them would be obliged to say that they never heard of him. They would ask, as old Governor Shirley did when he heard of the nomination of John and Sam Adams to the General Court of Massachusetts-Bay—"who the devil *is* Franklin Pierce?" Now this is a great advantage. He has no enemies. His character can be made up to suit customers. But as to the main qualification of making a clean sweep of all the Whig office-holders and rewarding his friends with the spoils of his victory, he may be relied upon. His name will be as good at the tail of a commission as that of Washington himself. The Democrats mean to come into power, and one counter will serve as well to mark their success as another. The South nominated him, the North accepted him, Cass, Buchanan and Douglass all hail his name as the best in the world, after their own.

We know very little about General Pierce, and nothing that is very bad. We take him to be a second-rate New Hampshire lawyer. He can hardly be a *first* rate one, or he would have left it long ago. New Hampshire has produced her share of eminent men in various lines, but precious few have ever *staid* there. But though one might not like to employ him in a case involving five hundred dollars, he is quite good enough for a President of the United States. And then he did go, as one of Mr. Polk's Volunteer Generals, to Mexico, and he *did* fight, which is more than most of our New England fair-weather soldiers could say. He besieged cities and not *senoritas*, and actually stood his share of fire. This is another great element of success. Shall we not see him, soon, in all the shop windows charging up impossible hills against incredible odds, over heaps of slain and with cannon balls flying about him like hail drops? To be sure, we shall. General Scott will find that *he* was not the Conqueror of Mexico, after all. He deserved no credit for what he did. It was all in the line of his profession. "His business 'tis to die!" But General Pierce's business is to fill writs and enter appearances. As soon, however, as the trumpet sounded that the honour of the country was in danger, he pitched his docket into the grate and rushed to the field. And after conquering Mexico, he returned to the pursuits of place, and his suits at law. The only thing even the Whigs allege against him is that he is fond of good liquor. If true, the charge will do him no harm—contrariwise, good. He will not lose one vote by it, and will gain many. The most blatant advocates of the Maine Law in Massachusetts are among the fiercest partizans of Mr. Webster—who is said to be no enemy to a glass of wine. Who wants a milk-sop for President? And good may come out of this thing, if true—which we do not affirm. As the *London Quarterly* said of Mr. Webster's War Speech, "that an appeal was taken from Philip drunk to Philip sober," so it may happen that an appeal may at some odd time lie from Philip sober to Philip drunk. No possible good think can come, we all know, from a sober President; who knows that a tipsy one might not stagger into some honest action? We go for the experiment.—E. Q.

### THE DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM.

THE Convention at Baltimore nomlnated their candidates, Franklin Pierce and William R King, before they erected their platform. The Free Soilers of this State are comforting themselves with the reflection that Gen. Pierce did not reply to the Scott Letter, though they do not state—if they know—whether he intended thereby to maintain an independent position, or whether he was not disposed to make a laughing-stock of himself by presuming to be a Presidential candidate. At any rate, for the Democratic Free Soilers, it is a fortunate accident that he declined to reply to the Letter, and they mean to make the most of it.—The Platform erected by the Convention, they will follow the lead of the *Evening Post*, by declaring that they have not seen him standing upon it. The camel is by no means a large one for a political swallow. They could gulp it down were it ten times the size.

We copy below the Resolutions of the Convention. Of course Mr. King, of Alabama, is no more certain to abide by it than is Gen. Pierce, of New Hampshire:

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS.

The Committee on Resolutions then submitted their Report, through Mr. Brown, of Tennessee, the Chairman. It was read by Mr. French, as follows:

Resolved, That the American democracy place their trust in the intelligence, the patriotism, and the discriminating justice of the American people.

Resolved, That we regard this as a distinctive feature of our political creed, which we are proud to maintain before the world, as the great moral element in a form of government, springing from and upheld by the popular will; and we contrast it with the creed and practice of federalism, under whatever name or form, which seeks to palsy the will of the constituent, and which conceives no imposture too monstrous for the popular credulity.

Resolved, Therefore, that, entertaining these views, the democratic party of this Union, through their delegates assembled in a general Convention of the States, coming together in a spirit of concord, of devotion to the doctrines and faith of a free representative government, and appealing to their fellow-citizens for the rectitude of their intentions, renew and re-assert, before the American people, the declaration of principles avowed by them when, on former occasions, in general Convention, they presented their candidates for the popular suffrages.

1. That the Federal Government is one of limited powers, derived solely from the Constitution, and the grants of power made therein ought to be strictly construed by all the departments and agents of the Government; and that it is inexpedient and dangerous to exercise doubtful constitutional powers.

2. That the Constitution does not confer upon the General Government the power to commence and carry on a general system of internal improvements.

3. That the Constitution does not confer authority upon the Federal Government directly or indirectly, to assume debts of the several States, contracted for local internal improvements, or other State purposes, nor would such assumption be just or expedient.

4. That justice and sound policy forbid the Federal Government to foster one branch of industry to the detriment of any other, or to cherish the interests of one portion to the injury of another portion of our common country; that every citizen and every section of the country has a right to demand and insist upon an equality of rights and privileges, and to complete and ample protection of person and property from domestic violence or foreign aggression.

5. That it is the duty of every branch of the Government to enforce and practise the most rigid economy in conducting our public affairs, and that no more revenue ought to be raised than is required to defray the necessary expenses of the Government, and for the gradual but certain extinction of the public debt.

6. That Congress has no power to charter a National Bank; that we believe such an institution one of deadly hostility to the best interests of the country, dangerous to our republican institutions and the liberty of the people, and calculated to place the interests of the country within the control of a concentrated money power, and above the laws and will of the people; and that the results of Democratic legislation, in this and all other financial measures upon which issues have been made between the two political parties of the country, have demonstrated to candid and practical men of all parties, their soundness, safety and utility, in all business pursuits.

7. That the separation of the moneys of the Government from Banking institutions is indispensable for the safety of the funds of the Government and the rights of the people.

8. That the liberal principles embodied by Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence, and sanctioned in the Constitution, which makes ours the land of liberty and the asylum of the oppressed of every nation, have ever been cardinal principles in the Democratic faith; and every attempt to abridge the privilege of becoming citizens, and the owners of soil among us, ought to be resisted with the same spirit which swept the alien and sedition laws from our statute-book.

9. That Congress has no power under the Constitution to interfere with or control the domestic institutions of the several States, and that such States are the sole and proper judges of everything appertaining to their own affairs, not prohibited by the Constitution; that all efforts of the Abolitionists or others, made to induce Congress to interfere with questions of Slavery, or to take incipient steps in relation thereto, are calculated to lead to the most alarming and dangerous consequences; and that all such efforts have an inevitable tendency to diminish the happiness of the people, and endanger the stability and permanency of the Union, and ought not to be countenanced by any friend of our political institutions.

Resolved, That the foregoing proposition covers, and was intended to embrace, the whole subject of Slavery agitation in Congress; and therefore the democratic party of the Union, standing on this national platform, will abide by and adhere to a faithful execution of the acts known as the Compromise measures settled by the last Congress—the act for reclaiming fugitives from service or labour included—which act being designed to carry out an express provision of the Constitution, cannot with fidelity thereto be repealed, or so changed as to destroy or impair its efficiency.

Resolved, That the democratic party will resist all attempts at renewing in Congress, or out of it, the agitation of the Slavery question, under whatever shape or colour the attempts may be made.

Resolved, That the proceeds of the public lands ought to be sacredly applied to the national objects specified in the Constitution; and that we are opposed to any law for the distribution of such proceeds among the States, as alike inexpedient in policy and repugnant to the Constitution.

Resolved, That we are decidedly opposed to taking from the President the qualified veto power, by which he is enabled, under restrictions and responsibilities, amply sufficient to guard the public interest, to suspend the passage of a bill whose merits cannot secure the approval of two-thirds of the Senate and House of Representatives, until the judgment of the people can be obtained thereon, and which has saved the American people from the corrupt and tyrannical domination of the Bank of the United States, and from a corrupting system of general internal improvements.

Resolved, That the democratic party will faithfully abide by and uphold the principles laid down in the Kentucky and Virginia resolutions of 1792 and 1793, and in the report of Mr. Madison to the Virginia Legislature in 1799; that it adopts those principles as constructing one of the main foundations of its political creed, and is resolved to carry them out in their obvious meaning and import.

Resolved, That the war with Mexico, upon all the principles of patriotism and the laws of nations, was a just and necessary war on our part, in which no American citizen should have shown himself opposed to his country, and neither morally nor physically, by word or deed, given aid and comfort to the enemy.

Resolved, That we rejoice at the restoration of friendly relations with our sister republic of Mexico, and earnestly desire for her all the blessings and prosperity which we enjoy under republican institutions, and we congratulate the American people upon the results of that war, which have so manifestly justified the policy and conduct of the democratic party and insured to the United States indemnity for the past and security for the future.

Resolved, That in view of the condition of the popular institutions in the Old World, a high and sacred duty is devolved with increased responsibility upon the democracy of this country, as the party of the people, to uphold and maintain the rights of every State and thereby the union of the States, and to sustain and advance among them constitutional liberty by continuing to resist all monopolies and exclusive legislation for the benefit of the few at the expense of the many, and by a vigilant and constant adherence to those principles and compromises of the constitution which are bread enough and strong enough to embrace and uphold the Union as it is, and the Union as it should be, in the full expansion of the energies and capacity of this great and progressive people.

### THE HARRISBURG (PA.) SLAVE CASE.

WE omitted, last week, for want of room, to give any account of the last alleged slave case in Pennsylvania. Of all the villainies that have been perpetrated under the Fugitive Act, none have been more atrocious than this. The local papers unite in denouncing it, and it seems to have aroused universal condemnation throughout the community where it was perpetrated. We copy below the report of the infamous proceedings, dignified by the name of trial, which preceded the Kidnapping under the form of law. From other sources, we learn that the unfortunate man, Phillips, was captured by some wretches who are only so far more respectable than the Commissioner McAllister, that they had the physical courage to venture upon a deed which he would shrink from committing with his own hands. They approached Phillips with some friendly salutation, and, thus having thrown him off his guard, knocked him down, and then conveyed him, in a state of insensibility, to the Commissioner's office. His wife was with him through his mock trial, and her shrieks are described as appalling when the decision was pronounced against him. She was taken away insensible. Phillips has, for many years, been known and universally esteemed in Harrisburg as a respectable and worthy citizen, holding a responsible position in the employ of the Rail-Road Co. Whether he was ever a slave, there is nothing in the evidence to show. This report of the pretended trial we copy from the *Harrisburg Standard:*

THE MAN-HUNT IN PENNSYLVANIA.

*Another Outrage on Humanity!—Beautiful Illustration of the Fugitive Slave Law!—Public Opinion entirely Reversed and Settled against the Summary Proceedings of Commissioner McAllister—the Second Sober Thought of the People.*

Last Monday, May 24th, the borough of Harrisburg was made the theatre of another outrage on humanity, under the sanction and colour of law, before United States Slave Commissioner, Richard McAllister. A coloured man by the name of James Phillips, who has resided here for the last fourteen years, was arrested as a fugitive slave, by constable Loyer, assisted by John Sanders, and carried before the Slave Commissioner for his unmistakable and well understood decision. The fact of the man's long residence, and his previous good character in every relation of life, had earned him many friends, which, in connection with his being a married man and a father of a family, elicited more than an ordinary amount of sympathy among our people as to the testimony that would be adduced, and the decision that might be rendered in his case.

The arrest was made in the afternoon while the man was in the discharge of his daily avocation as a driver of a team of horses, whereby cars are carried over the Railroad Bridge to the Cumberland side. He was forthwith taken before the Commissioner, who, it appears, was fully prepared to adjudicate the case on sight.

The examination of the *claimants* was immediately proceeded with, by placing on the stand a person who called himself Augustine G. Hudson. The testimony of this individual in effect was that he identified the prisoner as the former slave of his father, Dennis Hudson, of Culpepper county, Virginia—that the boy Jim was given by his father to his brother, as a servant, but with no bill of sale—that his brother sold his newly acquired property to Mr. Henry T. Fant, of Fauquier county, and that Mr. Fant hired Jim to a Mr. Blackford, who kept a furnace some thirty or forty miles over the Blue Ridge, in Page county.

At this stage of the examination Judge McKinney, who is recognised by our citizens as a philanthropist and an honest man, appeared and volunteered his services as his counsel. A few words were interchanged in the room within hearing of one of the witnesses, Mr. *Vowles*, who bent his ear to catch every word, in gross violation of all the chivalry, and the trial proceeded.

Mr. Blanche, a reporter of the Press, who was present, remarked that the evidence thus far elicited could not send a man back into a lifetime of Slavery, to which the Commissioner instantly retorted, by ordering him out of his office. Mr. Blanche claimed that the office was a court during any proceedings of a similar character—that he had no idea of interfering in the case, but he had rights as the representative of the Public Press, and in that capacity, dared maintain them, and announced his determination to remain and report the case.

The Commissioner then proceeded—with the expression that it was "thundering hot"—to the cross-examination. The witness testified that no bargain had been made by Mr. Fant to compensate him for his trouble, but he took it for granted Mr. Fant would pay his expenses, and, "if he chooses to give me something, I'll take it." "Jim" lived with Mr. Fant in 1838, and he recognised him notwithstanding the lapse of time; he had not seen him before since his escape (14 years); he was not over to Mr. Blackford's furnace during Jim's employment there, and all he knew was, Jim was *reported* to have left.

*Question* by Commissioner. Was pursuit made after him? *Answer.* I don't think there was; heard that he was in Pennsylvania, in Harrisburg, but did not know, or ever hear of any effort since 1838 to reclaim the boy; know he was hired out from year to year; did not remember what year he lived with Mr. Fant; think it was between '33 and '38; James Vowles, a school teacher, came with him—I take it for granted Mr. Fant will pay his expenses also.

At this stage of the proceedings, *Charles Rawn*, Esq., appeared and announced himself as having been employed as counsel by the friends of the prisoner, when the Commissioner refused to recognise him. Mr. *Rawn* demanded to see the papers, but the Commissioner gathered them up and declined giving him any information. Mr. *Rawn* persisted and claimed his right, and asked for the warrant. The Commissioner said he declined taking any notice of him. Mr. *Rawn*—I want to see the warrant, sir, as the prisoner's counsel. *Commissioner*—You can't have the warrant, sir. I decline having anything to do with you. I am not to be interrupted by every lawyer in town. Proceed, Judge McKinney (*very peremptorily*). Are you going on with the case, sir? *Judge McKinney*—Don't speak to me that way, sir. I am not to be intimidated. I will not suffer you to use such language to me. It is not the first time, Mr. McAllister, and I will throw up the case. *Commissioner*—Go on with the case—be quick—it is "thundering hot."

*Examination continued.*—Know the boy only by the name of Jim; don't know how old he was when my brother sold him; had information he was in Harrisburg by letter. By whom? *Commissioner* here interrupted the examination by saying he had decided before, and did again, that a witness need not disclose who gave the information, and told the witness not to answer the question. The witness consequently refused, exceptions taken. Brought a power of attorney with me; gave it to John Sanders. Several questions were here asked by Mr. Rawn, to ascertain who gave the information, which the Commissioner ruled out and told the witness not to answer. Mr. *Rawn* said he would ask what questions he pleased, and any effort to stop him would also stop the witness' mouth; that he had rights, and he should maintain them, and demanded that his interrogations should be answered.

Mr. Rawn here got possession of the power of attorney, which described the alleged fugitive as *six feet high, but it had been erased and altered to five feet eight inches, with the sand fresh on the ink, and called the attention of the Reporter and those in attendance to the fact.* The Commissioner said the erasure was of no consequence, and then asked if Mr. McKinney had finished, and resumed the examination as before in person, Judge McKinney objecting to it, and wishing his objection noted; but the Commissioner overruled it, and asked of the witness if he ever heard of Mr. Fant setting "Jim" free. *Answer*—Never, and two weeks ago was the first intimation he had of his being in Harrisburg.

*James H. Vowles*, sworn—Live in Culpepper county, Virginia, near Stephensburgh; is a farmer, and teaches school; knows Dennis Hudson; *thinks* that the prisoner is the slave of Mr. Fant. There is a family likeness by which I recognise him; I live in Warrington; I heard Dennis Hudson say he gave the boy "Jim" to his son William; he was an uncle of mine; have not seen him since 1832 or 1833, twenty years ago; Jim might have been at that time about 16 years of age; has no special mark; recollect him from his family likeness and that of his brothers. By Mr. Rawn—How old are you, sir? I am *thirty-two* years of age. Mr. Rawn—Why, sir, you must have been a boy between 11 and 12 years of age when Jim left? Yes, sir. Mr. Rawn—Why, you don't pretend to tell us that you can identify this man Jim, who was but sixteen and you a mere boy of eleven or twelve years of age, after so long a lapse of time? Yes, sir, I *think* I can recollect. Mr. Rawn—Who gave the information? Witness said he did not think the question pertinent, and the Commsioner directed him not to answer any such question. This witness went through a more extended examination, but we give above the substance that was elicited bearing upon the case.

Mr. McKinney then addressed the Commissioner on the illegality of some of the testimony given, the indefiniteness and insufficiency of the evidence as to the ownership by the claimant and the alleged escape, and the want of proof to justify an order of removal.

The Commissioner, however, drew out the papers already drawn up, and filled in the name of James Phillips. Mr. Rawn called the attention of the Commissioner to such a singular way of doing business—to which he replied, that if he waited until the hearing of the case, he would have to stay up all night to make them out, &c. The alleged fugitive was then handed over to the custody of the officers and immediately conveyed directly across the street into Dauphin county Jail. The entire street was filled with citizens of both sexes, and when Phillips' wife saw him dragged into the prison door, she gave vent to her feelings in the most agonizing screams, which rent the air as she was conveyed to her desolate home. Fathers and mothers who had never witnessed the practical workings of the infamous Slave Law, now openly denounced it, and an entire revolution in public sentiment displayed itself throughout the borough. In the morning, at six o'clock, Phillips was taken in the cars to Baltimore, and at four in the afternoon to Virginia. So great was the feeling manifested that an agent was dispatched to Baltimore to ascertain the price set on Phillips, and purchase his freedom, to which our citizens very generally and very liberally contributed; but up to the time of our going to press no further news has been received beyond the safe arrival of the agent in Baltimore, and his expectation of their bringing Phillips back to that city to be sold.

*Postcript.*—Mr. Shell has returned from Baltimore without procuring any tidings. It is presumed the officers have taken Phillips on to Richmond. Arrangements are being made to send immediately another agent all the way on to Farquier county, Virginia.

PRESBYTERIAN GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT CHARLESTON, S. C.—This body of American Christians has held its General Assembly, this year, at Charleston, and its bearing and presence have been a source of great delectation to the fire-eaters of that city. The Rev. J. C. Lord, of Buffalo, was chosen Moderator, an election which the *Charleston Mercury* announces with 'much pleasure.' "To the distinction of a learned and zealous divine," that paper says:

"Dr. Lord has also added that of a bold and able advocate of the constitutional rights of the South. He has wrestled strongly with the accursed errors of abolition fanaticism; and, in the midst of its votaries, stood forth in behalf of equity and good faith. For his noble service he has, of course, been assailed by the revilings and abuse. But in being elected to preside over so memorable a body, we have most ample tribute to the unimpeachability of his character and conduct. It is moreover no little praise to this assembly to say that it knew how to appreciate and honour such a man."

The Charlestonians no doubt feel assured that Dr. Lord would, like another well-known D. D. of the Unitarian faith in Boston, feel it his duty "to turn away a fugitive slave from his door;" or that, like another, late of this city, he would feel it his duty to send his own mother into Slavery to save the Union; or that, like another, under the shadow of whose church we are now sitting—literally, we mean, not morally, thank Heaven—he would not pray for the emancipation of the slaves even if he knew his prayer would be immediately granted. The *Mercury* need not think that the Presbyterians have a monopoly of such saints as these. The North could accommodate the South with a loan of more of them than she has ever captured of her runaway chattels. We wish she would ask for them; there would be a very respectable vote, if the question could go to the people, to make her a free gift of the whole of them.

As the city of Boston gave the Methodist Convention a run down the harbour, so Charleston proposed to row the Presbyterians up the Cooper river. Had there been a Presidential Candidate in town to tell them that he had heard of some of the fathers of their church, as Mr. Webster assured the Methodists *he* had once read Wesley's journal, perhaps the Presbyterians also would have twisted their faces into a grim simle of delight that such an honour had befallen the patriarchs, and have thought better of a trip up the Cooper. As it was, however, though they first accepted, they afterward, for some reason, declined the invitation. Perhaps they thought it would be more prudent, and avoid a scandal if they declined to settle the question by personal observation, whether men and women who are bought and sold like beasts, who are protected by law only as beasts, are treated altogether like beasts also. On the debate on this point, the *Charleston Standard* gives the following report:

On motion of Dr. SCOTT, the Assembly agreed to reconsider the vote to accept the invitation of the committee in reference to the Cooper river excursion.

Mr. BAKER moved that the invitation of the committee be accepted for Saturday morning.

Mr. LOWRIE moved an amendment to the effect that the thanks of the Assembly be returned to the committee for their kind invitation; but that, owing to a press of business, the Assembly deem it inadvisable to accept the same.

Dr. HALLEY hoped the invitation would be accepted. The members of the Assembly had been labouring diligently, and were worn out under the heat of the day and by sleepless nights. A day of recreation would not retard the business. Saturday would be a broken day anyhow, and would be well spent in seeing the productions of the country. It was not incompatible with the nature of their exercises or their devotions. Many members would go on this trip on their own notion, if they could do so, but there was no public conveyance in the river, and the committee, in providing a boat, and inviting the Assembly to an excursion, exhibited an unparalleled liberality. He hoped no Northern man would vote against accepting the invitation.

Mr. HILL.—The fanatics of the North said that the delegates could see nothing of the South, without going on the plantations. He, therefore, rejoiced that this opportunity for going there had been offered to the

ists, and bitterly complaining that they do not make the proper exceptions, it is *prima facie* evidence either of the obtuseness of his understanding, or the impenitence of his heart—either that he is under the influence of that 'fear of man which bringeth a snare,' or is affected with a sickly charity—either that he is pro-slavery in spirit or position, or has yet to 'remember those in bonds as being bound with them.

12. Resolved, That the Abolitionists have experimentally realized the truthfulness of the words of Jesus—' If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his household?'—that, in being charged with infidelity and treason, by a blood-stained priesthood and by self-seeking demagogues, it is merely a renewal of the old Satanic device by which Jesus was declared to be a blasphemer, possessed of a devil, and guilty of sedition, and his apostles to be pestilent and seditious fellows, who were seeking to turn the world upside down; and that such charges, from such sources, are the brightest evidences of a blameless life, an enlightened zeal for the truth, a sincere abhorrence of injustice, and a paramount desire to extend and establish the kingdom of peace and righteousness; therefore,

13. Resolved, That, instead of allowing themselves to be diverted from the direct prosecution of their glorious enterprise, by attempting to show that they are not what they are maliciously described to be, it is for Abolitionists to arraign as 'sinners of the first rank' all those who maintain that slaveholding is not a *malum in se*, or are guilty of aiding in its support.

Mr. Garrison moved that the series on the Church, be now taken up, in connection with resolution 1st. This was agreed to.

S. May, Jr., by request of the Finance Committee, offered the following resolution, and it was adopted.

Resolved, That the members of this Convention, and all others attending its meetings, are requested to contribute towards the expenses of the same, the sum of One Dollar, or any smaller or larger sum, according as they may have disposition or ability.

Parker Pillsbury made a very able speech, to which the sketch we give does little justice. That is Christianity, he said, rightly understood, which does the work the world needs. That is Infidelity, rightly understood, which wages war upon the world's freedom peace and welfare. The church of this country dooms the best men and women among us to hell—even those who are true to the precepts of Jesus and of Paul; and if hell is to be peopled with such as they, it will be a place far more desirable than heaven. I could look forward calmly to going to such a hell, for I should be sure that neither I, nor my wife, nor my child, were in danger of being enslaved. But if we should go to heaven, with the majority of the American churches and ministers, and with the great body of the Methodist General Conference now in session in this city, I know we should not be safe. But this American church is doomed. Even now, it is not only trembling, but crumbling. It is the hater of God, and of his poor and suffering children; it sides with their oppressors, and it is no place for honest men. A new dispensation is demanded, and we shall have it. A new Gospel is needed, and it will be preached. One of the Methodist ministers at Faneuil Hall said that Daniel Webster had been his President for fifteen years. I am glad Daniel Webster has had one man to preside over, for I don't believe he will ever have another. I am glad, too, that that one man was a minister. We have been told of a trinity of gold, silver and copper, which this people worships. There is another trinity before which they bow; and it may be expressed or represented by the following persons, viz: Daniel Webster, Captain Rynders, and the Methodist Conference. Mr Pillsbury declared that the Wesleyan body, the Free-Will Baptists, and other professedly Anti-Slavery denominations, ought not to be excepted in the resolutions, for they are in fact hostile to the Anti-Slavery movement. The vilest *hunkerism*, said he, finds support among them. He urged the Abolitionists to stand firm, not to compromise one jot, nor seek union with any man or party, which holds any lower standard; and they will command the respect of the world, and accomplish their great work.

Daniel Foster, recently a minister in the Orthodox Church, testified to the worldliness and want of principle among the great body of the churches and ministers with whom he came in contact. He referred particularly to visits he had recently made to several towns in the State, and spoke of the pro-Slavery spirit among the Orthodox ministers, to the slanders poured out by them on the Abolitionists, and to the prejudice of colour, and colonisation spirit of hate to the coloured man, which seem to be extending among *religious* people of all denominations.

Adjourned.

Afternoon.—E. L. Capron, one of the Vice Presidents, in the Chair. As soon as the Convention was called to order, and the resolutions on the church had been read by one of the Secretaries, the floor was taken by Rev. Mark Trafton, of Roxbury, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, who declared that he came to defend himself and his church from the vile slanders of the Abolitionists. A full sketch of his remarks will be given in another place. For one hour and three-quarters did he talk, the Convention hearing him with great patience, and allowing him the freest and most unrestrained use of their platform. He took advantage of their courtesy to the utmost, and, upon the instant of finishing his remarks, gathered together his papers, caught up his hat, and made a precipitate retreat from the house, though followed thick and fast by cries of 'Shame, shame'—Coward, coward.'

S. S. Foster had arisen to reply, immediately upon Mr. Trafton's closing his remarks, and he called to Mr. T. to stop and hear for *one half hour* a REPLY to his speech of more than one hour and a half. But all that could be said seemed only to add wings to Mr. Trafton's flight, and Mr. Foster suggested to all concerned the consolation found in the fact, that

> "He that fights and runs away,
> May live to fight another day!"

After some further preliminary remarks, Mr Foster said, The gentleman has admitted that Slavery is the greatest conceivable sin and wrong. He has quoted the words of John Wesley, the founder of Methodism, that Slavery is *the sum of all villanies*; and he has confessed, in our hearing, that the Methodist Church *could not put that hateful system*, that *sum of all villanies*, out of its bosom. What greater condemnation of that church could be uttered? A man appears here professedly as the defender and eulogist of the Methodist Church, and begins by saying that it has 'the *sum of all villanies* so firmly fixed upon it that it cannot get rid of it. Mr. Trafton stated to us that their preachers were forbidden to hold slaves. I wished to correct him, and rose to do so, said Mr. Foster; but you saw that he wouldn't permit me to ask a question. And why? He knew that he was stating that which was false, and that I should expose him. The discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, forbids the *travelling* preachers only to hold slaves. The *local* preachers are far more numerous than they, and there is no prohibition of their holding slaves! And, with regard to the former—*travelling* preachers—it only requires them to emancipate their slaves, 'when practicable!' (Mr. Foster held the Book of Discipline of the Methodist Church in his hand, and read from it while he spoke). It has recently been declared in the *Christian Advocate*, the organ of the M. E. Church, by a correspondent, that Gorsuch, the Maryland slavehunter who was killed at Christiana, in Pennsylvania, was a class-leader in the Methodist Church, and 'a Model Methodist.' Again—Mr. Trafton alleged that Bishop Andrew had been put out of his office, as a Bishop in the M. E. Church, because he held slaves. Mr. Foster showed by the Minutes of the Conference, that Bishop Andrew had never been put out of office. He was suspended, *as it was said*; but it was voted that his name should stand as before, with those of the other Bishops, in the Minutes, Hymn Book and Discipline—that his support should be paid to him as before—and that the work, in which he should be employed, should be determined by his own decision and action! The Southern members of the Conference were not satisfied with this, and demanded greater explicitness; when the Conference declared that they intended neither to depose nor to suspend Bishop Andrew—that he was a Bishop still; and that all his acts, as such, were to be valid!!

Mr. Foster declared that the Methodist Church South went off and left their Northern brethren, from sheer disgust at their double-dealing, prevarication, and hypocrisy; and he said he had unspeakably more respect for the M. E. Church South, and believed they were actually purer, than the Northern Church.

The Pittsburgh General Conference, four years ago, did vote to admit a delegate from the Church South within their bar—not indeed as a *delegate*, but *as a Christian brother!*

The hour of six having arrived, Mr. Foster suspended his remarks.

Mr. Garrison referred to the recent case of Horace Preston, given up into Slavery in New York by Commissioner Morton, but purchased back by the subscriptions of sundry individuals of that city. The *owner* of that man was the Rev. Mr. Reese, of Baltimore, a Methodist preacher, and one of the signers of the certificate, read by Mr Trafton, that Hope H. Slatter, the slave trader, was not a member of the M. E. Church.

Adjourned.

Evening.—Edmund Quincy in the Chair.

Joseph Barker made a full and very able reply to Rev. Mark Thrafton's afternoon speech. He followed Mr. Trafton through all his crooked places, his turnings and doublings, and brought him forth (or his statements and assertions, rather), in such a way that they looked anything but creditable and honest. But as Mr. Barker has written out his speech for publication, and it will be given under another head, the Secretaries forbear any sketch.

Rev. Theodore Parker followed, and in an admirable and most uncompromising speech (which it is hoped he will prepare for publication) held the large audience enchained for more than an hour.

In the course of his speech, some one in the audience sent him a slip of paper, from which he read that the telegraphic report from Washington this evening was, that Charles Sumner had that morning brought in a bill to the U. S. Senate for the repeal of the Fugitive Slave Law, and gave notice that he should speak on the subject at an early day. The audience seemed as if electrified by the statement; most of them rose, and gave reiterating cheers for Charles Sumner, in the most enthusiastic manner. It afterwards appeared that Mr. Sumner had only presented a petition from the New England Yearly Meeting of Friends; and had said he intended to speak on the subject at some suitable time, *hereafter*—complacently reminding the Senate that thus far he had been dumb, and had 'left the discussion of this all-absorbing question mainly with Senators from another quarter of the country.' (N. B. The session of Congress has already lasted six months, and Mr. Sumner has yet to utter the first syllable against Slavery as a system, or the Fugitive Slave Law as a disgrace to the Statute book!)

Adjourned to Thursday morning.

THURSDAY.....May 29th.

The Convention met at the hour of adjournment. Edmund Quincy in the chair.

John Rand, of Milton, gave his views of the religious aspects of the Anti-Slavery question.

Mrs A. K. Foster moved that the consideration of the question of funds be assigned for 11 1-2 o'clock this morning. Adopted unanimously.

Mrs. F. introduced the following resolution:

Whereas, the people of this country are not governed by their statutes, constitutions or office-holders, but by the public sentiment of the community; therefore,

14. Resolved, That the only work which the Abolitionists have to perform, in order to accomplish their object, is to enlighten the understandings and purify the hearts of the masses.

Mrs. F. proceeded to show that our people, in their habits and conduct, are not governed by their Laws and Statutes, but by the prevailing moral sentiment. Very many laws are on the Statute books of this State, which are continually and openly violated; such is the law on profane swearing, the law on the observance of Sunday, the law of usury, &c., &c. There is a State Law forbidding the jails of this Commonwealth to be used for the detention of persons claimed as fugitives from Slavery. In Worcester county, and in the State generally, this law can easily be enforced, for the public sentiment sustains it. But in the city of Boston, the very Court House, built and owned by the tax-payers of Suffolk county, is turned into a Slave Prison; and the laws of the State were trampled on, to enable Southern kidnappers, with the help of the Boston police, to carry off their victim. Mrs. F. went on to give a great variety of other illustrations of her position.

The Business Committee introduced the following resolution:

Resolved, That this Convention will now proceed to make donations and pledges of money, to be expended, during the coming year, in the holding of One Hundred Anti-Slavery Conventions within the New England States, under the supervision and direction of the Board of Managers of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society.

The resolution was sustained by Chas. L. Remond, of Salem. He adverted to the manifest policy of the United States Government to swallow up new and vast territories to be converted into slave territory. He predicted, if these schemes were successful, that the enslaving of white men would become common. He urged the importance of aiding generously the efforts of the New England Anti-Slavery Convention.

Samuel May, Jr., made a brief report of the manner in which the funds of the last Convention had been expended, under the direction of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society.

Wm. J. Watkins, of Boston, urged that the great principles of the cause be rigidly adhered to. He spoke particularly of the insidious and maligant operations of the Colonisation Society.

Mr. Garrison made a few remarks on the superior strength of moral principle. It is the power behind the throne, stronger than the throne itself. Let that only be right, and the political action cannot fail to correspond thereto.

G. W. F. Mellen, of Boston, read a long statistical estimate he had made of the increased business and profit which would follow the abolition of Slavery. He also offered a series of resolutions. No action was had upon these documents.

Adjourned.

Afternoon.—Effingham L. Capron in the Chair. Rev. Mr. Griswold said he had been pained and astonished at hearing the remarks which fell from Rev. Mr. Trafton, yesterday, concerning the Methodist Church, and his position in it. The admissions he had made are a stronger condemnation of that Church than anything else that can be said. He expressed the great interest he had felt in this Convention, though, perhaps, not agreeing with all its friends had said. Yet *the truth*, as he believed, had been uttered here with great fidelity and great effect; and he prayed God that truth might soon have a perfect victory.

The Business Committee, by Mr. May, introduced the following resolution:

15. Resolved, That on the most reliable authority we know that, with the full knowledge of our Government, there exists all along our South-Western border the same system of plunder and unprovoked aggression, of brutal outrage and inroad, as that which prepared the way for Texan annexation, and it is our confident belief that, unless almost superhuman efforts are made to the contrary, within seven years or less, the whole of Mexico will be overrun and annexed to the Union, only as a pathway, however, to the still further conquest of the cotton lands of South America bordering on the Gulf of Mexico; and we warn our fellow citizens of this gigantic scheme of plunder and conquest, which includes the subjugation of Hayti and the possession of Cuba, for the renewed invasion of which fresh plans are even now on foot, with the knowledge of our Government, in our Southern cities. Of this deep-laid and most momentous scheme we warn the North—a scheme relying for its execution on the restless banditti of the Mississippi valley, but fomented by the insatiable need and greed of the Slave Power, and designed to bribe the merchants by the prospect of quickened and most lucrative commerce; to buy the acquiescence of the manufacturing States by the gift of ten millions of new customers enclosed within the circle of our tariff system, and giving to the Slave Power an overwhelming increase of weight in the machinery of government, and we summon whatever is left in the nation of love of liberty, regard for national honour, or hope of the final triumph of equal justice and republican institutions, to rally for one last and momentous struggle with the giant Despotism of our land.

Rev. Mr. Foote, of Canada, spoke of the condition of the fugitive slaves there, and of the importance of making some provision for them. Canada was their home, and must be. And it is, in the main, a very eligible home; the climate of Canada West being decidedly milder than that of New England, New York, or even Pennsylvania. There are about 30,000 fugitive slaves in Canada.

Mr. Garrison, from the Business Committee, introduced the following series of resolutions, and, in connection therewith, read a letter which President Mahan, of Oberlin College, Ohio, had recently addressed to the Rev. Wm. Scott, and published in the Glasgow (Scotland) *Christian Examiner*:

Whereas, this Convention has listened to the reading of a letter, published in the Glasgow *Christian Examiner*, of April 24th, 1852, from the Rev. Asa Mahan, late President of the Oberlin College in the State of Ohio, to the Rev. William Scott, of Glasgow; and whereas, in the letter aforesaid, the author declares of the American Anti-Slavery Society, that 'it is not, properly speaking, an Anti-Slavery Society, but an infidel, no-human-government movement, using the Anti-Slavery sentiment as a club with which to strike down the Church and the State, and mainly the former'—that it is an association 'which, masking itself as an Anti-Slavery Society, is in fact aiming to prostrate Christianity itself'—that 'the progress of this Society is, in fact, an enlargement of the dead sea of infidelity'—that 'its public lecturers, agents and file leaders, hate Christianity and the Church far more than they do Slavery, who use their Anti-Slavery platform as a battery with which to assault the Bible and the character of a church, for no other reason than that it is a church and its members Christians'—that it is 'a Society which employs men knowing them to be guilty of such blasphemous outrages upon all that is sacred in religion and the religious sentiment in man—which is not what it professes to be, but is, in its fundamental tendencies and aims, an anti-church and an anti-Christian Society'—with many other similar allegations; therefore,

16. Resolved, That this Convention solemnly declares to the people of England and Scotland, that the Rev. Asa Mahan, in thus characterizing the American Anti-Slavery Society, is guilty of the vilest misrepresentation, in covertly circulating charges which we verily believe he knows to be false, which we defy him to prove, which find no credence in this country except among the enemies of the Anti-Slavery cause, which even the candid and enlightened among them repudiate with contempt, and which the corrupt sects, leagued with Slavery here, for twenty years, used as a stalking-horse to divert public attention from their guilty complicity with the traffickers in human flesh.

17. Resolved, That we appeal to the history of the American Anti-Slavery Society, and its action, from the time of its origin to the present hour, in proof that its 'infidelity' consists in this—in maintaining against the priesthood of the land, that the Bible is an Anti-Slavery volume; that the church of Jesus Christ gives no sanction to slaveholders, and admits no slaveholder to its communion; and that they, who, occupying the pulpit, are dumb in the presence of this 'sum of all villanies,' or who palliate its continuance, are not the ministers of Jesus Christ.

18. Resolved, secondly, That the 'no-governmentism' of the American Anti-Slavery Society consists in this—that while the Constitution and the laws of the nation command its citizens to protect, by physical force, the slaveholder against his slave, and to aid him in hunting the fugitive who has escaped from his plantation, and gives to the masters additional political power in proportion to the number of their slaves, it maintains that no Christian, no Abolitionist, can consistently take an oath to support such Constitution and such laws, but is bound, in utter disregard of their requirements and penalties, to hide the outcast, and obey God rather than man.

19. Resolved, That 'the head and front of our offending,' as pertaining both to Christianity and Government, 'hath this extent—no more.'

20. Resolved, That this attack of Mr. Mahan is all the more dastardly, from the consideration that, while present in meetings of the American Anti-Slavery Society, and engaged in discussions with its Agents, and even its President, William Lloyd Garrison, in regard to its principles and measures, he has never dared to impeach its Christian character, or to allude to its alleged infidel design and tendency.

21. Resolved, That in reiterating, especially in a foreign land, the charge against Mr. Parker Pillsbury, in regard to the baptism of certain dogs, which has been so repeatedly and publicly contradicted and disproved, in papers which cannot but have come under his notice, Mr. Mahan has been guilty of the most wanton and malicious libel; one which should deprive every other statement he can make on any subject of all title to be believed.

22. Resolved, That in further proof how inaccurate and utterly unreliable are all Mr. Mahan's statements, we instance his representation, that H. C. Wright is an Agent of the American A. S. Society, and that the Society, therefore, is to be held responsible for his peculiar opinions on government and religion; whereas, it has always been a matter of public notoriety, that Mr. W.'s delicate sense of personal independence has long since led him to labour in the field of philanthropy, on his own responsibility, without aid or credentials from any organization whatever; and while, as Abolitionists, it would be impertinent for us either to gainsay or endorse his views on any other subject than Slavery, we gladly avail ourselves of this opportunity, as an act of simple justice, to declare, that of all the slave's advocates, on either side of the Atlantic, no one has been more true, single-eyed, disinterested, laborious, uncompromising or fearless than Henry C. Wright.

23. Resolved, That in the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, during the last twelve years, the American Anti-Slavery Society has found a subtle, malignant and sleepless enemy, particularly in the person of its Secretary,—no pains having been spared, no opportunity left unimproved, to excite the most virulent religious prejudices in England against its leading advocates, and to prevent all benevolent co-operation with it on the part of the sympathizing friends of downtrodden humanity on the other side of the Atlantic.

24. Resolved, That an official copy of these resolutions, signed by the President and Secretaries of this Convention, be forwarded to the Editor of the Glasgow *Christian Examiner*, with a respectful request for their prompt publication, as an act of justice, in the columns of that paper.

Mr. Garrison commented upon the bitter and malignant spirit which characterized the letter of Pres. Mahan.

At the request of Lucy Stone, Mr. May made a statement respecting one of the Professors at Oberlin, viz., that he is living in a house purchased with money obtained by the sale of two women. The said Professor married a slaveholder's daughter; on the death of his father-in-law, two slave women and a child fell to his wife's share. The child was brought to Ohio; the women were sold as above. These facts Miss Stone had on what she deemed perfectly good authority. Mr. May added that he made the statement at Miss Stone's request; personally he knew nothing about the case, and, of course, could vouch nothing. Miss Stone had been herself a student at Oberlin for four years.

Rev. Mr. Foote came forward to the defence of the Oberlin Professors. He said President Mahan was a strong man, but very often he did not know what he was about. He would run the whole length of the room to meet and embrace a friend, and then sit up nights to abuse him. He will speak well of a man, and then turn right about and cry him down. His friends do not consider him always responsible for what he says and does. As to Professor Fairchild, of Oberlin, he did marry a Southern woman, whose father was a slaveholder; and, at his death, money came to Professor F. But the story of the house was untrue. Professor F. lived in a house, a considerable part of which was built with his own hands, and, to aid him in which, money was contributed by the students and others [noise and shouts in the galleries].

Mr. Garrison was sorry that President Mahan was not present to see who were his backers.

Lucy Stone came forward. The disorderly persons and (as the Savannah paper called them) 'the rabble' in the galleries, and the back of the house, screamed, and shouted, and whistled at the sight of Miss Stone. Mr. May called upon them at least to treat *a young lady* with decency. The noise subsided, and Miss Stone said that she was a graduate of Oberlin, and it was anything but agreeable for her to say one word against that institution. It had been the means of doing much in removing the prejudice against colour. Students, white and coloured, studied together, eat together, without yielding to the cruel influences of this prejudice. 'It is true,' she continued, 'that Professor Fairchild had lived in a house, as Mr. Foote had said, built in part with his own hands. But when his wife's father died, and money, obtained in the way mentioned, came into his possession, he wanted a larger and better house, and sold the small one, and bought another.'

Her remarks were received with hearty cheers.

James N. Buffum said that these efforts, by President Mahan and others, whose tool he was, were now making in Great Britain, and especially in Scotland, in order to take a dastardly revenge upon Mr. Garrison, Mr. Thompson, H. C. Wright, and their friends generally, because the gentlemen named had exposed and denounced the union of the so called *Free* Churches of Scotland with the slaveholding churches of the United States, and had called upon the leaders in that church to *send back the money* which slaveholders had contributed to the Free Church treasury.

Stephen S. Foster said that President Mahan had denounced him by name in the Glasgow letter which had been read. He did not think this circumstance made him feel towards Mr. Mahan any differently from what he otherwise should. He had repeatedly met President Mahan in Ohio, and he had always experienced courteous treatment from him. Mr. Mahan had never breathed to him the first sentiment resembling those he had penned to the Glasgow clergyman. It was not a long time since he and Mrs. Foster had visited Oberlin, and had had interviews with President Mahan, Professor Morgan, and others of the officers there. And it was then invariably '*Brother* Foster,' and '*Sister* Foster,' on the part of President Mahan, &c. When we arrived at Oberlin, there was a *revival* in progress. They begged us not to commence our lectures upon Slavery then. But we told them we could not yield that—that if it were a genuine revival of religion in which they were engaged, we should do them no harm; if their religion were of God, we should help them; and if we, by preaching Anti-Slavery, checked their revival, that would show their work to be of man. We went on, therefore, and gave our Anti-Slavery lectures. And Professor Morgan said to us, 'I am not able to see any essential difference between your position and ours.' Now, these men, who had treated him as a Christian brother to his face, were behind his back denouncing him as an infidel, and seeking to destroy his reputation and Anti-Slavery influence. Mr. Foster quoted from a work of President Mahan on Moral Philosophy, in the later editions of which he justifies falsehood under certain circumstances! Probably he thinks that his letter in the Glasgow *Examiner* is a case of justifiable lying—being for the glory of God, and the overthrow of infidelity! Mr. F. also related some circumstances which had occurred to him at Oberlin and vicinity, in which he was astonished to find that a downright falsehood about himself lay between two parties, viz.: Professor Morgan on the one hand, and a neighbouring minister on the other. He asserted that Professor Morgan had admitted he had told a falsehood about him (Mr. Foster). Mr. Foster charged both President Mahan and Professor Morgan with falsehood; and, said he, I am prepared to prove my charges before any tribunal. And I do not go across the water to make my charges, but I make them here, openly, in the presence of the friends of President Mahan, and where they themselves will be sure to know of them.

In the course of discussion, Mrs. A. K. Foster stated that Mr. Mahan had ceased to occupy the position of President of the Oberlin Institution.

The question on the series of resolutions relating to Pres. Mahan and his charges against the American Anti-Slavery Society being called for, was then taken, and resulted in a full and unanimous vote in their favour.

Miss Stetson, of Bridgewater, made a few remarks relating her experience while seeking to join the Church of Christ. She had early joined what was called a Christian church; she was satisfied it was not so, and she left it. Attracted by the doctrines and views of Swedenborg, which she believed were pure and elevating she joined that church. But she found his professing disciples cold, unfeeling, pro-slavery; and she left them. She met with the volume of Mr. Garrison's writings; they seemed to her to be the very truth, and her soul received them heartily. She attended some of the Anti-Slavery meetings, and found the sentiments and deeds inculcated there to be in full harmony with the life and gospel of Christ. She believed that the Anti-Slavery movement was the true Church of God, and she trusted to devote her life to it.

Adjourned.

Evening.—Edmund Quincy in the Chair.

Rev. John Marshall, of Michigan (a coloured man), spoke in opposition to separate churches and religious societies for the coloured people.

Parker Pillsbury spoke on the church resolutions. He referred to Mr. Trafton's appearance on our platform yesterday, and expressed his satisfaction at Mr. T's coming. As a text, or preface, to what he was about to say, he would read the following resolution:

Resolved, That of all the religious bodies in the United States, none are more devoted to the support of Slavery than the great Methodist Church of the North; nor does any other bear or exhibit a more malignant and devilish spirit towards the Anti-Slavery cause and its advocates; and, inasmuch as it is all done with the loudest boasts and professions of hatred and hostility to Slavery, we are constrained to regard that body as more dangerous (if possible) to the interests of humanity, than any other under whose baneful influence the country now suffers.

He quoted the clause of the Methodist Book of Discipline, which forbids the *travelling* preachers to hold slaves. And what virtue is there in such a prohibition? The *travelling* preachers do not want slaves; could do nothing with them if they had them. When they become *local* preachers, and get a habitation, then they may hold and deal in slaves as much as they like. So it is to be supposed that these Methodists expect that, at the great and final judgement day, the questions will be put something on this wise: 'Were you a *travelling* preacher?' Yes. 'Did you hold slaves?' Yes. 'Depart, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels.' 'Were *you a local preacher*?' Yes! 'Did you hold slaves?' Yes. 'Come, ye blessed of my father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you.'

The Methodist Church is claimed to have been always Anti-Slavery, and never to have favoured Slavery in any way. The General Conference of the Methodist Church, in 1836, passed a Resolve, in which they 'wholly disclaim any right, wish or intention, to interfere in the civil and political relation between master and slave, as it exists in the slaveholding States of this Union.'

At the next General Conference, in 1840, on motion of Rev. Dr. Few, of Georgia, the following was adopted:

'Resolved, That is is inexpedient and unjustifiable for any preacher to permit coloured persons to give testimony against white persons, in any State where they are denied that privilege by law.'

There were then 80,000 slaves, men and women, connected with the Methodist Church. And why was their testimony shut out? Let those answer, who know to what cruel usage, and to what unhallowed passions, the slaves are bound to submit, or die.

(This resolution was said to have been rescinded four years latter).

Mr. Trafton has admitted, in our hearing, that there are slaveholders and slaves in their churches. He told us, however, of only three slaveholding conferences, the Baltimore, the Western Virginia, and the Missouri. On this point, too, his speech is calculated to deceive; as the Book of Discipline mentions seven or eight different Conferences, formed in whole or in part in slave territory, and comprising, within their limits, the entire slaveholding States of Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky, Missouri, and Arkansas.

Wendell Phillips addressed the Convention. As a somewhat full report of this speech, from phonographic notes, is to be given, the Secretaries attempt no sketch of it.

The following resolution, from the Business Committee, was read by Mr. Garrison:

25. Resolved, That in the death of Oliver Dennett, of Portland, since the last annual meeting of this Convention, the cause of the slave has lost an early, devoted, unflinching friend and advocate—the hunted fugitive, one who was ever ready to extend shelter and protection to him—the New England Anti-Slavery Convention, one ever prompt to cheer it by his presence, and aid it by his means; and to her whom he has left behind him, the active participant in his Anti-Slavery efforts, we offer our heart-felt sympathy, in view of her bereavement and our own.

It was adopted unanimously.

The question, on those Resolutions reported by the Business Committee, which had not yet been acted upon, then coming up—the President stated that, if any one desired to have the question taken on any resolution separately, it would so be put; otherwise, they would be presented in a body.

The resolutions were then unanimously adopted; and the Convention adjourned, *sine die*.

Edmund Quincy, *President.*
Samuel May, Jr.,
Eliza J. Kenny,
Alonzo J. Grover,
*Secretaries.*

## SKETCH OF THE REMARKS OF REV. MARK TRAFTON,

*At the New England Anti-Slavery Convention, Wednesday Afternoon, May 26.*

I have listened to the reading of the series of resolutions on the American church and clergy. Terrible resolutions they are. Of the *truth* of the resolutions, nothing is to be said. I believe they are all true, so far as the Word of God is concerned. And with the general conclusions to which they come, I believe I have no fault to find.

But I believe I am under obligation of duty to speak on some part of those resolutions. I am a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church (hear, hear). I am one of the 'dumb dogs' spoken of, which cannot bark. I may not succeed in barking; but perhaps I may bite, and that will be better.

I have not the least expectation of convincing you that the opinions you hold are not correct (hear); or that the sentiments you are daily expressing of our church are untrue. I have not the least hope of that.

Nor am I here to apologise for Slavery. I was not *converted*, sir, to Anti-Slavery. I was always opposed to Slavery. I believe it to be, in the language of the eminent man who was the founder of our church, the 'sum of all villainies.' Nor do I come to engage in strife with you—I am a man of peace.

But I come to defend myself and my church—(hear, hear). You accuse me of the deepest wickedness, falsehood, and villainy; and you do the same towards those who are in connexion with me. I wish to get a few words into the ears of those who daily read the slanders, inuendoes, and falsehoods, which you put forth against us. And you charge our church with being in alliance with Slavery; and with being morally paralyzed in its embrace. This, sir, I consider as most unjust and unchristian treatment.

I will tell you why I think so; because the Church, to which I belong, is *an Anti-Slavery Church* in its character, organism, laws, and testimonies. She has always been Anti-Slavery. All her testimonies have been, and are, against Slavery.

But you will ask, Why then is Slavery in the Church? In reply, I ask you—How is Slavery in the community anywhere? Why does your son rebel against your authority? You ask me, why we do not break up our Church, rather than suffer Slavery to remain in it? If my son rebels against my authority, why do I not disown him and turn him away, dissolve the family, take a new wife, and begin again? (laughter in the galleries). I don't come out of the Church, for the same reason I don't come out of the family.

But, Mr. President, I have no business here; and I will stop at any moment you shall say so.

The Presiding Officer (E. L. Capron). Understand, thee has time to speak as much as thee pleases.

Mr. Garrison. I hope the friend will understand that it is not a privilege of his, but a *right*, to be here; that he has the same right to speak here that we have; and, moreover, that it is his *business* to be here.

Mr. Trafton resumed. I thank you, sir. When John Wesley commenced his Church, 100 years ago, he would have no Slavery in it—he would have no rum-drinking in it. The first preachers of Methodism, who came to this country, bore a burning, faithful testimony against Slavery. After a while, they found they couldn't preach the Gospel at all, *if they didn't relax a little*. So they did. Perhaps, sir, *you* would have refused to preach the Gospel on such terms (hear)—perhaps *I* should. But those men, sir, were neither you nor me. They decided otherwise. Soon after, when the M. E. Church of this country was organized, there were thousands of slaveholders found in it—and doubtless among them there were ministers who were slaveholders.

Now I have said, and I still say, that the Methodist Episcopal Church is Anti-Slavery. I mean that it has always had an Anti-Slavery testimony in its Discipline. There stands the clause, forbidding *buying and selling of men and women, with intent to make slaves of them.*

I am not going into a metaphysical argument to prove to you that it is not the best way to get rats out of a barn, to burn the barn. You say we are dumb dogs, loving to slumber. I deny it. It is false; now and always false.

Who are *we*? asked Mr. Garrison.

Mr. Trafton. I will tell you, bye and bye. It is well known there has been a great division in the Methodist Episcopal Church. How came the division if the Church be so corrupt, so morally dead, as you represent it? I will tell you what caused the division. We of the North were uttering, from year to year, our Anti-Slavery testimonies; and the South was made uneasy.

There was another preliminary point I had passed by. Our Church has always borne a testimony that Slavery is *a sin in itself*. In our Annual Conferences [these are sectional bodies]—in our churches—in our books, and our papers, we have declared this. Sir, I have suffered more for my Anti-Slavery labours than any man here. I preached and wrote against Slavery twenty years ago, before Mr. Foster was hatched. And I repeat, it is unjust and unchristian to attack us as dumb dogs, &c., and I appeal from you to the people.

Again—there is a chapter on Slavery in the Discipline, which forbids the preachers holding slaves, in States *where the laws permit emancipation*. If a minister, holding slaves, does not execute a deed of emancipation, *wherever it is practicable*, he is disciplined.

Suppose I were living in one of these slaveholding States. Ought I to turn my slaves out of house, and let them go? I might do so, if I listened to impulse. There is a way to get rid of Slavery, and of everything else with it, in a general destruction. There is another way, viz.: to instruct your slaves, to help them, and bring them under religious influence as our Discipline enjoins.

S. S. Foster. Will the gentleman read the clause in the Discipline which follows?

Mr. Trafton. I understand what you mean. [He read to the effect that masters should instruct their slaves, *when allowed to do so by law.*]

I admit, sir, that slaves and slaveholders are in the M. E. Church. But our point is, *Our Rules are against Slavery*. If there were in the Church a moral power enough to execute her rules, we would turn Slavery neck and heels out of doors.

In the New England Annual Conference, we have passed resolutions of this character. I was Chairman, for several successive years, of the Committee on Slavery in that Conference. Mr. T. read extracts from a recent report of that Committee, in which Slavery was declared 'a great evil,' which ought to be extirpated. All the Northern and Eastern Conferences are taking action of this kind. I myself drew up a petition against the Fugitive Slave Law, which was signed by one hundred of our ministers, sent to the U. S. Senate and read there.

Sir, we have almost hazarded our lives to bear our testimony against Slavery, and it is most unjust to bring these charges against us. We are labouring to overturn Slavery; and we shall do it, if you will let us alone.

What was the immediate cause of the division in the M. E. Church, eight years ago? It was because the Baltimore Conference had refused ordination to a preacher who held slaves by marriage; and the General Conference sustained the Baltimore Conference.

Then Bishop Andrew's case occurred. Shall we have a slaveholding bishop? was the question. The Conference said, No; and he was deposed. The South then went off from us; I wish *all* the slaveholders had gone too. But the Baltimore Conference refused to go.

When the M. E. Church, South, sent delegates to the Annual Conference, four years ago, they were not admitted. So this year. Four or five ministers from the Church South have come here. I told them they would not be invited to preach in any Methodist church in Boston or the vicinity; and they were not. We have been charged with having slaveholding delegates in this Conference. It is not so.

I was talking, a few days since, with Rev. Mr. Houpt, of Western Virginia; he wanted us to send out young men into that region, who are thorough-going Anti-Slavery men. It is declared that there are no slaveholding members of the M. E. Church in all W. Virginia. And in the Baltimore, W. Virginia, and Missouri Conferences, there are no slaveholding *preachers*. I do not say there are no slaveholders there. We have not been able to enforce the Discipline there, for Slavery has been too strong for us.

It has been asserted frequently that the notorious Hope H. Slatter, the Baltimore slave-trader, is a member of the M. E. Church. Mr. T. read a certificate, signed by several ministers of Baltimore, that Slatter is not a member of their church.

I ask you, Abolitionists, why you are not consistent? What right have you to live in Boston, in this slave-catching city, drinking its water, breathing its air, living under its police regulations?

The members of the Methodist Conference went down the harbour, the other day, on an excursion, by invitation of the City Government. When that invitation came, I thought it was a *joke*; but, sir, it was a fact. We went, and we had a good time. If we were such a corrupt body as you have described us, would the city government of Boston fraternise with us in this manner?

[Remember you have called it a 'slave-catching city,' said Mr May.]

We were censured, too, for going to Faneuil Hall, to hear Daniel Webster speak. It is said we went *in a body*. Not true. Some went, and some did not. Those who went thought it best to walk there in procession. Daniel Webster is a great man—known everywhere—known especially in Austria!

N. B. The above is as full a sketch of Mr. Trafton's speech as the Secretaries were able to make. The moment Mr. T. had finished, he quitted the hall with great precipitation. It was an inglorious retreat; but worthy of the exhibition he had made of himself.

# Communications.

## *IMPORTANT ACTION OF THE SOUTH DEVON (ENG.) CONGREGATIONAL UNION.*

Leicester, Mass., June 5, 1851.

Dear Gay: I have just received, from one of our faithful and unwearied friends across the water, a copy of the following resolutions, and of the note of the gentleman who transmitted them to the Bristol and Clifton Society. The note was private, as will be seen, but I am authorized to publish it if desirable, and I am unwilling to withhold its clear and decided testimony.

I am, very truly, yours,
Samuel May, Jr.

### AMERICAN SLAVERY.

At the Annual Meeting of the Ministers and Delegates belonging to, and forming, the South Devon Congregational Union, held at Plymouth, Thursday, April 22, 1852, the Secretary presented a communication from the Bristol and Clifton Ladies' Anti-Slavery Society, after which the subjoined resolutions were cordially and unanimously passed:

1st. That this Union, considering the enormous evils connected with the system of American Slavery, and the extent to which that system is upheld by many Christian Churches, feels itself called upon to mark its special indignation at the outrages thus practised on the rights of human nature, and the sentiments of our common Christianity; and it hereby repudiates all kind of fraternity with such ecclesiastical communities, until they shall have cleared themselves from the guilt herein denounced, and so far redeemed the character which appertains to all Christian Churches worthy of the name of Him who came to "unbind every yoke and to let the oppressed go free."

2nd. That the foregoing resolution be advertised in the *Patriot, British Banner*, and *Nonconformist* newspapers; that a copy be sent by the Secretary to the *Bristol and Clifton Ladies' Anti-Slavery Society*, and also to the *Anti-Slavery Society* of London, with a request that they will ensure its transmission to America, and its publication in the United States.

John Pyer, *Secretary.*

Devonport, April 26, 1852.

The following is the letter to the Secretary of the Bristol and Clifton Ladies' Anti-Slavery Society, which accompanied the above resolutions:

Devonport, April 26, 1852.

Dear Madam—It gave me great pleasure to

# Miscellaneous Department.

## OLD HOUSEHOLD WORDS.

CERTAIN persons can hardly believe, although they live in the middle of the nineteenth century, and to whom the wonders of steam and electrity and familiar, that we have distanced our respectable ancestors in scientific knowledge. We purpose offering a few illustrations of the way in which that knowledge was applied to medical uses—to quote, in short, a few genuine Old Household Words.

The science of judicial astrology has few votaries now: natural philosophy is based on rather surer principles than of yore, and the healing art depends upon something more positive than spells. But exceptions may yet be found; there are still a select few—the country readers of Zadkiel, we will suppose—who prefer the charms of Ashmole, and the sympathetic powder of Sir Kenelm Digby, to the operations of Lawrence or the advice of Bright; and what these lovers of the *temporis acti* believe in, or, at all events, what our ancestors pinned their faiths to, we shall here expose.

The idea was suggested to us, while turning over some of the Ayscough MSS. in the British Museum; in which are preserved some very striking specimens of the pharmaceutical wisdom of our forefathers. We thought it a pity that knowledge so valuable should be concealed any longer; and although the handwriting bore no slight resemblance to that which puzzled Tony Lumpkin, we patiently set to work to transcribe some of the most remarkable "remedies" contained in the precious volume.

Oliver Goldsmith has said, in the "Citizen of the World," that the epidemic of England is the fear of mad dogs. The apprehension appears to be of old date, for the receipt-books of our ancestors are filled with remedies against their bite. The Ayscough MS. gives us various examples, two of which we select—one simple medicinal, the other purely occult: "A cataplasm made of nutts, with an onion, salt, and honey, helpeth the biting of a madd dogg." We should value this receipt more than we do, if we could feel quite certain who it is intended to benefit; for as the sentence stands, it appears doubtful, whether the object be to assist dogs in biting, or patients in recovering.

The charm receipt is not a very difficult one to remember: "For the bite of a madd dogg, say 'Lemus, Lamus, Remus, Ramus, Oxiologe!,'" It is to be presumed that this formula must be utterred before you are bitten: few dogs, we conceive, would be mad enough to bite the person who repeated it.

This view of the case is confirmed by what you are advised to do after the bite has actually been perpetrated. "Charme for those who are madd, man or beast. The haire being cut off, lay betony to the mould of the head. Then wright theis words *on a peece of cheese*, 'Antanbragon, Tetragrammaton,' and give the party so diseased." The art of writing on cheese is one of the secrets which, unfortunately, our ancestors have not handed down to us. If they had but left a receipt for that also, we would at once have made a large investment—say in "single Gloucester"—and sent in a tender to the Governors of St. Luke's.

Having made our patient sane, let us see what the Ayscough MS. recommends to keep him so: "At such time as menne sow beanes, take a beane, and put it into the harte of a black catt, being reddy rosted. Then bury it in a dunghill; and, when they be ripe, carry one about thee, and thou shalt never goe madd."

We regret to remark, that in all these simple and easy remedies, there is always some obscurity as to the manner of reducing them to practice. What we want to know here is, which is to be roasted—the bean or the cat's heart? Roasting beans is a very familiar process, as all coffee dealers know; cats, too, have been roasted, as Spanish novelists assure us—so there is no difficulty about the cookery; but the question remains—which? We pass over the pleasant notion of carrying about one's person an article that had been so agreeably inhumed, and merely observe, that we think it imposible anybody could go mad who adopted this remedy.

Our ancestors stood greatly in fear of being poisoned; and perhaps, in the days when a pair of perfumed gloves could quietly accomplish the prisoner's purpose, they were not so far wrong. Here is a remedy for a poisoned wound: "Take a toad and put it into a glass, and stopp it very close; inclose this glass in some earthern vessel filled full with sand, thereby the better to prevent it breaking; so sett it over the fire till it be consumed to ashes, and apply them to the place wounded, and it is a present remedy." Slightly cruel, as far as the toad is concerned; but that is a trifle.

Let us try another, for the bite of a scorpion; it is worthy of King Midas: "Saye to an asse, secretly, and as it were whispering in his eare, 'I am bitten with a scorpion.'" A remedy which gives rise to such natural good-fellowship deserves to be a successful one.

The following receipt is recommended to young officers going out to join their regiments in the West Indies: "If onions be eaten raw" (though this would scarcely be allowed, if the regiment was at all "crack"), "and strong wine be drunk frequently after them, they are good against the biting of serpents; and are good for them that are infected with poison, and for such as have cold passions."

Amongst the most annoying disorders of the olden time, the colic was pre-eminent. That universal specific "punch" had not then been discovered, and our ancestors were limited to colder prescriptions. The Ay-cough MS. says: "Old decrepit cocks have softer flesh than those which are younger; and a pottage thereof is held good for the colic passion."

Nobody would greatly object to cock-a-leekie, but the next cure for the same complaint is not quite so pleasant; it suggests the remark, that the remedy is worse than the disease: "Horse dung, drunk in wine, will prevent the colick." Few persons, afflicted with the ailment, would we fancy, be inclined to try the antidote: but our ancestors were not the nicest in their tastes. Many of their receipts, though simple, were comprehensive.

"The juice of pomegranates dropped in the eyes is a remedy for the yellow jaundice." If the feet of those that have the gout be washed with the broth of turnips, it will mitigate the pain." Here is a quaint intimation: "Asparagus doth mollify the belly gently." We should imagine the next remedy to be of doubtful efficacy: "To heare *well*. Stop up the eares with good dry sewet."

Let us turn from these plain specifics to those which owed their value to an occult influence. Here is one for the headache, only available, however, we apprehend, for the lady of Mr. Calcraft: "A charme for the headache. Tie a halter about your head wherewith one hath been hanged." Tied a little lower, it would cure not only the headache, but all "the natural ills that flesh is heir to." The next is invaluable for nurses, especially if they be Irish ones: "A charme for the chincough. Take three sips of a chalice when the priest has said masse, and swallow it down with good devotion." We should like to know what is in the chalice!

Agues are cured in various ways. The following is one of them: "Take a crust of bread, and write these three words following, and, after they be writ, eate them; 'Calinda, calindan, calindant.'" Here the only difficulty that strikes us is the old calligraphic one. How do you write on bread? With a toasting fork?

We commend the following to practitioners who are fond of experiments: "To release a woman in travell. Throwe over the top of the houses where a woman in travell lieth, a stone or any other thing, that hath killed three living creatures—namely, a man, a wild-boare, and a shee beare." It would be so easy to get a stone, or "any other thing," that had performed these three successive feats.

It may be doubted whether any of the swell-mob of the present day would manifest the proper degree of emotion caused by the application of the charmed herb, vervain. "For theft, touch all the suspected with this herb, and *the theefe shall weepe*." Vervain was a very cunning simple. In one particular it superseded the art of old Izaak Walton. "To catch fish. Carry vervaine about thee, and say '*Venite*,' and all fishes shall come about thee." Perhaps, vervain might help one to a glimpse of the real sea-serpent.

Vervain was also found a very useful ally in affairs of love; but, on this subject, the receipt books of the middle ages are eloquent. Listen to the Ayscough MS., though it is almost dangerous to society to communicate such facts as the following. However, we will venture. "To see one's mistress. Take foure haires of her hedd, and a thred spunne upon a Friday, of a puer virgin, and make a candle therewith of virgin wax, four square, and *wright with the bloud of a cocke-sparrowe* the name of the woman, and light the candle, whereas it may not dropp upon the earth. And she will come to the candle." Like a moth, no doubt. But there were devices more potent still: "Take the tongue of a sparrowe, and close it in virgin wax under thy upward clothes the space of four Fridays, and keepe it in thy mouth, *sub lingua tua*; then kisse thy love, *et ipsa te amabit*." Or another, more practicable: "Say unto a woman in her lett eare, 'Veneto, melchy, mobelchy—follow me. Fiat.'" We should think so. The next receipt is quaint and pleasing: "Take a redd frog and bury him in a hillock. Then take the bones and lay them on a tile stone redd hot, till he lift over himself on the other side. So let it lie till she is so likewise. Then make powder thereof, and strew them on her clothes whom thou loveest, and she shall love thee." There is a little confusion of genders in the preceding, but we must not be too particular. Here is another of the same class: "Take a batt" (no easy matter); "let him bloud with a glass or flint, and with the blood wright this letter, D, and touch a man or woman, and they will follow thee. For triall touch a dogg and he will follow thee."

We are travelling a little out of the record, but the transition from the material to the marvellous, is so unsuspiciously set forth in the Ayscough MS. that we cannot resist a few more illustrations of ancestral wisdom. The following ought to be worth something, especially if one could name the winner of the Derby by means of it:

"A perfume made of hempseede, and of the pleawort and violette roots, and parslie and smallage, maketh to see things to come, and is available for prophesie."

A policeman or a thief, we beg pardon of the former for the juxtaposition, would find this useful:

"To goe invisible. Take a pence of deal and wright thereon, 'Athatoss, Stiros, Theon, Pantocraton,' and put it under your left foote." In your boot, of course.

The usual receipt for seeing sights is to put a shilling in your pocket, but Ayscough MS. recommends other methods. "To see strange sights. Make an oyntment of the galle of a bulle and a fat of a henne, and anoynt your eyes." Again: "Take ants' egges and the bloode of a whyte henne, and anoynt your face therewith, and you shall see wonders." Another: "Take the fatt of a black catt and the fatt of a white henne, and anoynt your eyes, and you shall see marvellous things. If you would have any other to see them, let them set his foot upon yours and he shall see them."

Cornelius Agrippa, a name held in great veneration by our ancestors, has written a great deal to the same purpose as the above. One or two extracts from his "Occult Philosophy" will show what sort of wisdom he encouraged:

"The stringes of an instrument made of the gutts of a wolfe, and being strained upon a harp or lute, with the stringes made of a sheep's gutts, will make no harmony." Whoever sang to the instrument, we should think, would naturally howl. Cornelius Agrippa must have been fond of discord. Here is a receipt for prodneing it; we recommend it to the Protectionists, at the approaching general election: "A stone that is bit by a mad dog, if it be put in drinke, hath power to cause discord."

But the next is, perhaps, the pleasantest receipt we ever met with: "A cup of liquor being made with the brains of a bear, and drunke out of the scull, shall make him that drinks it be as fierce and as raging as a bear, and thinke himself to be changed into a bear, and judge all things to be bears; and so continue in that madness, until the force of the draught shall be dissolved, *no other* distemper being all this while perceived in him." The urso-mania appears to us to be distemper enough for the time. We believe in this receipt; for we have seen people who have taken "a cup of liquor" too much, behave themselves exactly like bears!

We wish we had as much faith in the last extract we shall make from the Ay-cough MS., which involves a secret that we understand many people have been anxious to discover for some time—namely:

"To make money spent, to return. Make a purse of mole's skinne and wright in it; 'Belzebub, Zetus, Caiaphas,' with the bloud of a batt. And lay a good pennie in the high waie, for the space of three days and three nights; and after put it in the purse. And when you will give it, say 'Vade et vine.'"—*Dickens' Household Words.*

## THE STUDY OF WORDS.

[From a Review of 'Trench's Study of Words,' in the *Literary World*.]

MR. TRENCH'S six lectures on the Study of Words, familiarly addressed to a class of young pupils in a diocesan school, form one of the most valuable illustrations of a science which is every day getting to be more of a science, yet presented to the public. They are at once the most agreeable curiosities of literature, and the most instructive lights of history, philosophy and morals.

No language can be richer in the history of its words than the English. Its composite character from different roots; the varied experiences in politics and religion of the people who have spoken it; their enterprise and free communication with the world by wars, discovery, commerce; their opportunities as colonists, travellers, missionaries; their adaptation of the ideas, inventions, science, and literature of all nations; the perpetual intellectual activity in which they have passed a thousand years: all these are facts and conditions which have left their constant record upon our language. To exhibit this history—involving the nicest processes of thought and criticism—in a popular form to the public, is one of the latest benefits conferred by philology. No study has appeared further removed from the interests of the great body of the people; no scholars have seemed more isolated than the commentators on language, no pedants have been more pedantic than the pedants of words. Yet a man of warm heart and clear head comes along, like Mr. Trench, and finds amidst this dry grammatical and dictionary rubbish, seeds of a generous culture of morality and philosophy, turning this choking guano heap of words and scholia to fertility and beauty.

Language with most men in everyday life is a paper money currency, which passes from hand to hand, bearing simply the signature of the day; to the eye of the student and man of reflection, words are a series of valuable coins impressed with the stam of different countries and eras, the portraits of kings and princes, the golden legends of loyalty and faith. Not one man in ten thousand is aware of the wealth of his language. To vary slightly the illustration which we have just employed, he uses words as common copper currency, which are silver or gold. Words have become trite expressions, literally as the coin has lost its effigy by use and handling. He would be a wise man who should seek to revive these images and recover this lost treasure. For words, thoroughly known and appreciated, are a perpetual historical treasure to a man. Perhaps we have no securer or more convenient possession than our language. A man who is rich in nothing else, may be rich in words; and as a gentleman will point to the genealogy of his ancestors or the dates and vintages of his wines, so we may say with some pride, of this myriad-formed English tongue which we use—This word came in with William the Conqueror, for that you may go to the days of Homer, this bit of Latin was cherished by the Roman church, this ludicrous term sparkles with the laughter of the middle ages; the law bequeathed us this, medicine the next, and divinity a third; one word bears the brand of Shakspeare, another the label of Dryden; this blossomed on the old Germanic stock and has a twang of the Rhine, while this is of home growth, and smacks sharply of the forest or prairie. The hasty necessities of American life are told in our clipped pronunciation, our Websterian spelling, and cant expressions. Our western emigrants, in the paucity of schoolmasters and dictionaries, use words as they do their kettles and saucepans, making one, as "fix" for instance, do duty for a dozen. To the same result, fops, from sheer ignorance and lack of ideas, have some universal, fashionable cant word which they employ on all occasions.

It is Mr. Trench's pleasure to trace the moral history of words, a pursuit congenial to his profession and study as a devout clergyman, in which he beats up some curious game:

### DEGENERATED WORDS.

"How many words men have dragged downward with themselves, and made partakers more or less of their own fall. Having originally an honourable significance, they have yet, with the deterioration and degeneration of those that used them, deteriorated and degenerated too. What a multitude of words, originally harmless, have assumed a harmful as their secondary meaning; how many worthy have acquired an unworthy. Thus 'knave' meant once no more than lad (nor does it now in German mean more), 'villain' than peasant; a 'boor' was only a farmer, a 'varlet' was but a serving-man, a 'churl' but a strong fellow. 'Time-server' was used two hundred years ago quite as often for one in an honourable as in a dishonourable sense 'serving the time.' 'Conceits' had once nothing conceited in them; 'officious' had reference to offices of kindness and not of busy meddling; 'moody' was that which pertained to a man's mood, without any gloom or sullenness implied. 'Demure' (which is, 'des mœurs,' of good manners) conveyed no hint, as it does now, of an over-doing of the outward demonstrations of modesty. In 'crafty' and 'cunning' there was nothing of crooked wisdom implied, but only knowledge and skill; 'craft,' indeed, still retains very often its more honourable use, a man's 'craft' being his skill, and then the trade in which he is well skilled. And think you that the Magdalen could have ever given us 'maudlin' in its present contemptuous application, if the tears of penitential weeping had been held in due honour in the world? 'Tinsel,' from the French 'étincelle,' meant once anything that sparkles or glistens; thus 'cloth of tinsel' would be cloth inwrought with silver and gold; but the sad experience that 'all is not gold that glitters,' that much which shows fair and specious to the eye is yet worthless in reality, has caused the word imperceptibly to assume the meaning which it now has, and when we speak of 'tinsel,' either literally or figuratively, we always mean now that which has no reality of sterling worth underlying the glittering and specious shows which it makes. 'Tawdry,' which is a word of curious derivation, though I will not pause to go into it, has undergone exactly the same process; it once conveyed no intimation of *mean* finery, or *shabby* splendour, as now it does."

And again, showing the disposition in men, by their hypocrisies, to pervert everything sacred and noble:

"Thus for instance is it with the word 'prude,' signifying as now it does a woman with an overscrupulous affectation of a modesty which she does not really feel, and betraying the absence of the reality by this over-preciseness and niceness about the shadow. This use of the word must needs have been the result of a great corruption of manners in them among whom it grew up. Goodness must have gone strangely out of fashion, before things could have come to this. For 'prude,' which is a French word, means virtuous or prudent; 'prud'homme' being a man of courage and probity. But where morals are greatly and almost universally relaxed, virtue is often treated as hypocrisy; and thus, in a dissolute age, and one disbelieving the existence of any inward purity, the word 'prude' came to designate one who affected a virtue, even as none were esteemed to do anything more; and in this use of it, which, having once acquired, it continues to retain, abides an evidence of the corrupt world's dislike to and disbelief in the realities of goodness, its willingness to treat them as mere hypocrisies and shows.

"Again, why should the word 'simple' be used slightingly, and 'simpleton' more slightingly still? According to its derivation, the 'simple' is one 'without fold,' sine plica; just what we may imagine Nathaniel to have been, and what our Lord attributed as the highest honour to him, the 'Israelite without guile;' and indeed, what higher honour could there be than to have nothing double about us, to be without duplicities or folds? Even the world, that despises 'simplicity,' does not profess to approve of 'duplicity,' or double-foldedness."

* * * * *

"Thus 'silly,' written 'seely' in our earlier English, is beyond a doubt the German 'selig,' which means 'blessed.' We see the word in its transition state in our early poets, with whom 'silly' is so often an affectionate epithet, applied to sheep as expressive of their harmlessness and innocency. With a still slighter departure from its original meaning, an early English poet applies the word to the Lord of Glory himself, while yet an infant of days, styling him 'this harmless *silly* babe.' But here the same process went forward as with the words 'simple' and 'innocent.' And the same moral phenomenon repeats itself continually. * * * * *

"The French have their 'bonhommie' with the same undertone of contempt, the Greeks also a well-known word. It is to the honour of the Latin, and is very characteristic of the best side of Roman life, that 'simplex' and 'simplicitas' never acquired this abusive signification."

You give man a good word, and, like a beggar on horseback, he soon rides with it to the devil. Truly, do words, like men, show traces of the Fall. Verily, as said Dr. South, "an Aristotle" using the noblest language under heaven in a noble way, "is but the rubbish of an Adam!"

The national history in words is a topic on which Mr. Trench has brought together some of the results of the best scholarship—as in the oft-mentioned distinction of

### SAXON AND NORMAN TERMS.

"While the statelier superstructure of the language, almost all articles of luxury, all that has to do with the chase, with chivalry, with personal adornment, is Norman throughout; with the broad basis of the language, and therefore of the life, it is otherwise. The great features of nature, sun, moon, and stars, earth, water, and fire, all the prime social relations, father, mother, husband, wife, son, daughter, these are Saxon. The palace and the castle may have come to us from the Norman, but to the Saxon we owe far dearer names, the house, the roof, the home, the hearth. His 'board' too, and often probably it was no more, has a more hospitable sound than the 'table' of his lord. His sturdy arms turn the soil; he is the boor, the hind, the churl; or if his Norman master has a name for him, it is one which on his lips becomes more and more a title of opprobrium and contempt, the villain. The instruments used in cultivating the earth, the flail, the plough, the sickle, the spade, are expressed in his language; so too the main products of the earth, as wheat, rye, oats, bere, i. e. barley; and no less the names of domestic animals. Concerning these last, it is not a little characteristic to observe (and it may be remembered that Wamba, the Saxon jester in *Ivanhoe*, plays the philologer here), that the names of almost all animals so long as they are alive, are thus Saxon, but when dressed and prepared for food become Norman—a fact indeed which we might have expected beforehand; for the Saxon hind had the charge and labour of tending and feeding them, but only that they might appear on the table of his Norman lord. Thus ox, steer, cow, are Saxon, but beef Norman; calf is Saxon, but veal Norman; sheep is Saxon, but mutton Norman; so it is severally with swine and pork, deer and venison, fowl and pullet. Bacon, the only flesh which perhaps ever came within his reach, is the single exception."

Not the least curious of the special historical examples is

### THE WORD DUNCE.

"We may all know what a 'dunce' is, but we may not be as well acquainted with the quarter whence the word has been derived. Certain theologians in the middle ages were termed schoolmen; being so called because they were formed in the cloister and cathedral schools which Charlemagne had founded—men not to be lightly spoken of, as now they often are by those who never read a line of their works, and have not a tithe of their wit; who moreover little guess how many of the most familiar words which they employ, or misemploy, have descended to them from these. 'Real,' 'virtual,' 'entity,' 'nonentity,' 'equivocation,' all these, with many more unknown to classical Latin, but which now have become almost necessities, were first coined by the schoolmen, and passing over from them into the language of those more or less interested in their speculations have gradually filtered through the successive strata of society, till now they have reached, some of them, to quite the lowest. At the revival of learning, however, their works fell out of favour: they were not written in classical Latin: the form in which their speculations were thrown was often unattractive; it was mainly in their authority that the Roman church found support for many of its perilled dogmas; on all which accounts, it was considered a mark of intellectual progress and advance to have broken with them and altogether thrown off their yoke. Some, however, still clung to these Schoolmen, and to one in particular, *Duns* Scotus, the great teacher of the Franciscan order; and many times an adherent of the old learning would seek to strengthen his position by an appeal to its great doctor, familiarly called Duns; while the others would contemptuously rejoin, 'Oh, you are a *Dunsman*,' or more briefly, 'You are a *Duns*'—or, 'This is a piece of *dunsery*;' and inasmuch as the new learning was ever enlisting more and more of the genius and scholarship of the age on its side, the title became more and more a term of scorn; 'Remember ye not, says Tyndal, 'how within this thirty years and far less, the old barking curs, *Dunce's* disciples, and like draff called Scotists, the children of darkness, raged in every pulpit against Greek, Latin, and Hebrew?' And thus from that long extinct conflict between the old and the new learning, that strife between the mediæval and the modern theology, we inherit the words 'dunce' and 'duncery.'"

The derivation of tariff points to a barbarous origin, which might serve for a sting in the tail of a sentence for a free-trade speech:

### THE FIRST TARIFF MEN.

"Nor is the true derivation of 'tariff' unworthy to be traced. We all know what it means, namely, a fixed scale of duties, levied upon imports. If you turn to a map of Spain, you will take note at its southern point, and running out into the straits of Gibraltar, of a promontory, which, from its position, is admirably adapted for commanding the entrance of the Mediterranean sea, and watching the exit and entrance of all ships. A fortress stands upon this promontory, called now, as it was also called in the times of the Moorish domination in Spain, 'Tarifa;' the name indeed is of Moorish origin. It was the custom of the Moors to watch from this point all merchant-ships going into, or coming out of, the Midland sea; and issuing from this stronghold, to levy duties according to a fixed scale on all merchandise passing in and out of the straits, and this was called, from the place where it was levied, 'tarifa' or tariff;' and in this way we have acquired the word."

The history of words is the history of trade and commerce. Your very apparel is a dictionary:

"The 'bayonet' tells us that it was first made at Bayonne—'cambrics' that they came from Cambray—'damask' from Damascus—'arras' from the city of the same name—'cordwain' or 'cordova,' from Cordova—'currants' from Corinth—the 'guinea,' that it was originally coined of gold brought from the African coast so called—'camlet' that it was woven, at least in part, of camel's hair. Such has been the manufacturing progress of England that we now send our calicoes and muslins to India and the east; yet the words give standing witness that we once imported them thence; for 'calico' is from Calicut, and 'muslin' from Moussul, a city in Asiatic Turkey."

And so you might go on, with the aid of Mr. Trench's suggestions, the invaluable historical dictionary of Richardson, and a true taste for the reading of the best classic authors—calling upon words to give an account of themselves, and meeting everywhere among them stern moralists and boon companions.

---

THE LATE GRAND DUKE OF BADEN.—Caspar Hauser, the Grand Duke of Baden, who died on Saturday, leaves several sons; the eldest of these is an idiot, and to whom the ducal throne cannot, therefore, be confided; but the family have resolved that the succession shall take place in due order, only the government of the duchy shall be confided to the second son, Prince Frederick. It is hoped by this means to avoid giving to the other claimants to the throne the opportunity of again disputing the rights of the present family which would be offered by an irregular succession. These claimants are, however, already in the field, in the persons of the reigning family of Bavaria, whose claims to a portion of the duchy have been urged on more than one occasion, and, indeed, were put forth no later than last year by King Maximilian II. of Bavaria. How, notwithstanding the existence of apparently direct and legitimate male heirs to the ducal throne, the Bavarian sovereign, as the head of the House of Wittolsbach, can put forward any claims at all, is a curious question. In the year 1806 the Emperor Napoleon compelled the then Grand Duke of Baden, Duke Charles Frederick, to marry his son, Duke Charles, to Stephanie Tascher de la Pagerie, a niece of the Empress Josephine. The fruits of that marriage were two sons and three daughters. All of the latter are now living—one is married to the Marquis of Douglas. The first son died very suddenly, and when the second son disappeared, or died very suddenly, no records of either are to be found. Duke Ludwig, the younger brother of Duke Charles, was exiled from court for a very considerable period by his father, the then reigning Grand Duke. A fate seemed to attend the male children brought into the world by Stephanie. Suspicions of foul play were very general at the time, and were directed solely against Duke Ludwig, who was known to be ambitious of succeeding his father, and who hated the Duchess Stephanie and her children. Duke Charles died, and on the death of his father, Duke Ludwig ascended the ducal throne. Duke Ludwig remained unmarried, leading a life of the wildest and most criminal character. He was succeeded by a half-brother, namely, the person just deceased, who was the son of Duke Charles Frederick, the father of Ludwig, by another union, a "left handed" marriage with a lady of the court, the Countess Hochberg, the legality of which is now disputed by the Bavaria branch. During the reign of Ludwig, it happened that a wild idiotic youth was found one fine morning sitting in the streets of Leipsic, and unable to give any account of himself. His tongue gave forth only unintelligible and indistinct sounds. Taken care of and instructed by kind Samaritans this youth, who had given to him the name of Caspar Hauser, gradually made known that his previous existence had been passed in a cell underground, in which he had only seen one person; that he had never seen the daylight until a few days before his discovery in Leipsic, when his keeper carried him out of the cell and transported him to the place in Leipsic where he was found. Inquiries, public and private, were made in all directions without any result. Suspicions of various kinds arose, a paper war ensued, some authors treating Caspar Hauser as an ingenious imposter, others enunciating boldly the suspicion that he was the heir to the Baden throne. Facts, however, were wanting to prove the connection, and while the inquiries were still pending, poor Caspar Hauser was suddenly murdered in Nurnberg. The wanting facts have never been supplied, though the chain of circumstantial evidence has been increased and strengthened. It was known at the time of the paper war alluded to, that a pamphlet on the subject announced for publication, as containing some of the wanting proofs, had been bought off by some unknown person. This unknown person was subsequently proved in a court of justice to have been Major Hennenhofer, the creature and confidant of Ludwig, the minister to and participator in all his dissipations. Major Hennenhofer was also seen in Nurnberg on the evening when Caspar Hauser was murdered. Were an inquiry to be made, it is possible that more evidence on the subject would be forthcoming, and the identity of Caspar Hauser with the missing son of Duchess Stephanie be clearly established. The duchess has preserved on this subject the strictest silence. Her present position and influence in Paris might, perhaps, if the suspicions which have prevailed are well founded, induce her to break that resolution, and visit with vengeance the family for whose advantage her own sons were made away with. Ludwig succeeded his brother, and on his death the reigning family of Bavaria laid claim to a portion of the duchy, founding their claim on the illegitimacy, or rather the unequal birth, of the children of Grand Duke Charles Frederick by the Countess Hochberg. According to the law in Germany, these children, of whom the late grand duke was one, are excluded from taking sovereign rank. The matter has been inquired into by federal commissioners, with the view, of regulating it, and providing against difficulties. In 1818, and 1830, when the deceased Grand Duke succeeded to the ducal throne, federal commission sat at Frankfort. The latter decreed that in order to procure the unity of the duchy, the children of Countess Hochberg should be considered of equal birth. The Wettolsbach family (Bavaria) disputed that decree then, and entered their protest against it. That protest will, it is reported, be renewed now; of all the rulers of Bavaria, not one assumes a higher and more ambitious tone than King Maximilian, and if it be renewed and followed up, all the facts must be again inquired into.—*Glasgow Examiner.*

---

PREJUDICE AGAINST COLOUR.—A few days after, Mrs. D. called in to see me. She was an American; a very respectable old lady, who resided in a handsome house on the main road. I was at dinner, the servant girl, in the meanwhile, nursing my child at a distance. Mrs. D. sat looking at me very seriously until I concluded my meal, her dinner having been accomplished some hours previously. When I had finished, the girl gave me the child, and then removed the dinner service into an outer room.

"You don't eat with your helps," said my visitor; "is not that something like pride?"

"It is custom," said I; "we were not used to do so at home, and I think that keeping a separate table is more comfortable to both parties."

"Are you not both of the same flesh and blood? The rich and the poor meet together, and the Lord is the Maker of them all."

"True, your quotation is just, and I assent to it with all my heart. There is no difference in the flesh and blood; but education makes a difference in the mind and manners, and, till these can assimilate, it is better to keep apart."

"Ah! you are not a good Christian, Mrs. Moodie. The Lord thought more of the poor than he did of the rich, and he obtained more followers from among them. Now, *we* always take our meals with our people." Presently after, while talking over the affairs of our household, I happened to say that the cow we had bought of Mollineux had turned out exceedingly well, and gave a great deal of milk.

"That man lived with us several years," she said; "he was an excellent servant, and D. paid him his wages in land. The farm he now occupies formed a part of our New England grant. But, for all his good conduct, I never could abide him, for being a black."

"Indeed! is he not the same flesh and blood as the rest?"

The colour rose into Mrs. D.'s sallow face, and she answered, with much warmth. "What! do you mean to compare *me* with a *nigger*?"

"Not exactly; but, after all, the colour makes the only difference between him and uneducated men of the same class."

"Mrs. Moodie!" she exclaimed, holding up her hands in pious horror; "they are the children of the devil! God never condescended to make a nigger."

"Such an idea is an impeachment of the power and majesty of the Almighty. How can you believe in such an ignorant fable?"

"Well, then," said my monitress, in high dudgeon, "if the devil did not make them, they are descended from Cain."

"But all Cain's posterity perished in the flood." My visitor was puzzled. "The African race, it is generally believed, are the descendants of Ham, and to many of their tribes the curse pronounced against him seems to cling. To be the servant of servants is bad enough, without our making their condition worse by our cruel persecutions. Christ came to seek and to save that which was lost; and in proof of this inestimable promise, he did not reject the Ethiopian eunuch, who was baptized by Phillip, and who was, doubtless, as black as the rest of his people. Do you not admit Mollineux to your table with your other helps?"

"Good God! Do you think I would sit down at the same table as a *nigger*? My helps would leave the house if I dared to put such an affront upon them. Sit down with a dirty black, indeed!"

"Do you think, Mrs. D., that there will be any negroes in heaven?"

"Certainly not, or I, for one, should never wish to go there;" and out of the house she sallied in high disdain.

And this was the woman who had given me such a plausible lecture on pride. Alas! for our fallen nature! Which is the more subversive of peace and Christian fellowship—ignorance of our own characters, or of the characters of others?—*Roughing it in the Bush.*

---

# Gleanings from Foreign Publications.

SCOTCH MARRIAGES.—In a recent case at the Westminster Police Court, involving the validity of a Scotch marriage, a Mr. James Law said he was acquainted with the Scotch practice, and gave it as his opinion that the marriage was legal; that a man in Scotland was often married without knowing it; that a sweep or an applewoman might perform the ceremony, and it would still be a legal marriage, if the two persons declared themselves man and wife; and that it it would be equally legal if the bride and groom were drunk, provided they could say "Yes" and "No."

——THE QUEEN AND THE SHEPHERD'S BOY.—It is said, on the authority of the *Northern Warder*, that, one day last summer, Her Majesty was sketching on a public road, when a flock of sheep came up, driven by a boy, who, seeing some one in the way, shouted, with stentorian voice, "Stan' out o' the road, 'oman, and let the sheep gae by;" and no heed being paid to him, he exclaimed, still more rudely, "Fat are ye stan'in' there for? Gang out o' that, an' let the sheep pass." In answer to one of Her Majesty's attendants, who asked him if he knew whom he was addressing, he said, "Na, I neither ken nor care, but be fa she likes, she sudna be i' the sheep's road." "That's the Queen," said the official. The boy looked astonished. "The Queen! Od, fat way disna she put on claes that fouk can ken her, then?"

——GAME FEATHERS.—I do not know that any of your numerous correspondents have mentioned the common belief among the poor in this county (Sussex), that a person cannot die if his bed is stuffed with game feathers. A friend of mine, a little time back, was talking to a labourer on the absurdity of such a belief; but he failed to convince the good man, who, as a proof of the correctness of his belief, brought forward the case of a poor man who had lately died after a lingering illness. "Look at poor Muster S——, how hard he were a dying; poor soul, he could not die ony way, till neighbour Puttick found out how it were. 'Muster S——,' says he, 'ye be lying on geame feathers, mon, surely;' and so he were. So we took'n out o' bed, and laid'n on the floore, and he pretty soon died then?"—*Notes and Queries.*

——A LEATHER DRESS NOT SINGULAR.—Many persons have been amused, if not offended, at George Fox, because of his having worn a dress of leather when he was a young man. Perhaps in those days leathern garments for workingmen might not have been so singular as some suppose. It is a well-authenticated fact, that an eminent merchant of the city of London, about 150 years ago, travelled on foot from Newcastle, in search of a livelihood, clad in *a coat of leather*. He opened a warehouse in London for the sale of heavy articles of iron, which were manufactured in the neighbourhood of Newcastle. In a few years he became prosperous, accumulated a large fortune, and ranked with the magnates of the city, sharing in all the civic honours of the corporation.

The firm which he established still continues to conduct a flourishing business, at a warehouse in Thames street, which is familiarly known in the trade by "The Leathern Doublet;" a representation of the founder's original dress being fixed as a sign in front of the building.—*British Friend.*

——FORMS OF SALUTATION.—Most modern forms of salutation and civility are derived from chivalry, or, at least, from war; they all betoken some deference, as from a conquered person to the conqueror; just as in private life we still continue to sign ourselves the "very humble servants" of our correspondent. The uncovered head was simply the head unarmed; the helmet being removed, the party was at mercy. So the hand ungloved was the hand unguantleted; and to this day it is an incivility to shake hands with gloves on. Shaking hands of itself is but a token of truce, in which the parties took hold of each other's weapon hand, to make sure against treachery. So also a gentleman's bow is but an offer of the neck to the stroke of the adversary; and the lady's curtsey is but the form of going on her knees for mercy. This general principle is marked, as it ought naturally to be, still more strongly in the case of military salutes. Why is the discharge of guns a salute? Because it leaves the guns empty, and at the mercy of the opponent. And this is so true that saluting with blank cartridge is a modern invention. Formerly salutes were fired by discharging the cannon-balls, and there have been instances in which the compliment has been nearly fatal to the visitor whom it meant to honour. When the *Officer* salutes, he points his drawn sword to the ground; and the salute of the troops is, even to this day, called "*presenting arms*," that is, presenting them to be taken. There are several other details, both of social and military salutation of all countries, which might be produced; but I have said enough to indicate the principal.—*Notes and Queries.*

——INDIAN SLAVERY.—Slavery of able-bodied men for general purposes is, and I believe always has been, unknown in most parts of India, for this simple reason, that free labour is so cheap that Slavery is not profitable. Willing labour will always be more effective than unwilling labour, and, therefore, where there is an abundant supply of labour, and wages are so near the limit of subsistence as not to leave a margin of profit forced labour, a slave has no market value. If a slave has no value there are no slaves; and, therefore, real practical out-of-door slavery only exists where labour is valuable and wages are high. In India, generally speaking, every man's person and labour are his own, to make the most of them. We see, indeed, what may seem forced labour in the performance by certain classes of certain duties without remuneration in money, but this is much more of the nature of a contract, for they receive a fixed proportion of the grain of the whole village in lieu of their services, and any man in practice leaves the village when he likes, follows any occupation he likes, and acquires land if he can. The democratic freeman often claim the inferior inhabitants of the village as "adscripti glebæ," and they are, while they remain there, something in the position of serfs. One community ought not to entice away the serfs of another. But practically they have little hold of their persons, and there is nothing of the nature of *private* Slavery. Domestic Slavery, again, as existing in most oriental countries, is another matter, and applies chiefly to women or foreign eunuchs, and such like. Women are, under the Mahomedans, always subject to the authority of their lords, and the slave-girls are slaves for the convenience of great men. It appears, however, that in some peculiar districts of the south there was actual Slavery, some of the aborigines, in a dearth of labour, having been made slaves in Malabar and Canara.—*Modern India, by George Campbell, Esq.*

——WE (*London Advertiser*) have received the following letter from a friend who was lately passing through Prague, on his road to the East:

PRAGUE, Tuesday, May 4.

This evening, as I was leaving my hotel, the Blauen Stern (Blue Star), to take a walk with my friend, we saw a great bustle and crowd of people, with several police officers, on the stairs which lead from the Porte Cochère to the upper stories, up which two ladies were proceeding. A carriage and two horses stood at the door. Police officers, abounding in Austrian cities, we did not take particular notice of their presence, but asked one of them, who stood near, what was the matter. "Nothing, nothing," said he; "only the *haus frau* (landlord's wife) has returned from a long absence, and the people are all glad to see her." We thought no more of it, but about nine o'clock at night, in a café, an intimate friend of my companion's, a retired captain of Austrian cavalry, whispered to him—"Don't you live at the Blauen Stern?" "Yes," was the reply. "Was there not a great crowd and disturbance there, to day?" "I did n't see any disturbance; there was a good deal of excitement, apparently at the return of the landlord's wife." "My good fellow, that was not the landlord's wife, it was Kossuth's sister, and some other of his relations: they are on their way to America; but not a hundred people in the town know it, besides the police and they don't want it to be known." "And how did you know it, you were not there?" "Oh, I know everything." From this, and from other signs, I believe that sympathy exists in many bosoms besides the Hungarians, in favour of those who have made a stand against that frightful tyranny which makes politics, foreign or domestic, a forbidden subject of conversation in Austria; and, therefore, conceals beneath a veil of prudential reserve the real sentiments of the majority. I saw the report spread through a small circle at the café, and I watched the manner in which it was received. And this among Germans and Bohemians—not Hungarians—many of them officials. There are several regiments of H